



Same, different and other as comparative adjectives – A uniform analysis based on French

Citation

Charnavel, Isabelle. 2015. "Same, Different and Other as Comparative Adjectives – A Uniform Analysis Based on French." *Lingua* 156 (March): 129–174. doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2014.12.005. .

Published Version

doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2014.12.005

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:25506702>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Open Access Policy Articles, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#OAP>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

Same, Different and Other as Comparative Adjectives
A Uniform Analysis based on French
Isabelle Charnavel (Harvard University)

Abstract

The goal of this article is to provide a uniform and non-specific analysis for all constructions involving terms expressing similarity and difference (*sidi* terms) such as *same*, *different* or *other* in French. Beyond theoretical economy, the motivation for this enterprise is based on crosslinguistic evidence showing a unique term for *same* through all constructions in many unrelated languages. The proposed analysis does not resort to any specific mechanism, but relates *sidi* terms to both comparatives and relational terms: *sidi* terms are assumed to be relational adjectives that are complemented by DPs or comparative clauses; in short, they are analyzed as comparatives of individuals. The diversity of constructions does not derive from multiple lexical entries, but from the presence of silent structures: in particular, the comparative clause can be fully or partially elided, and the phrasal or clausal complement of *sidi* terms can include a silent underspecified pronoun, which can get a pronominal, reflexive, reciprocal or vaguer interpretation. The behavior of *sidi* terms in islands argues for the presence of silent structures.

Keywords

same / different / other

comparative

relational term

ellipsis

underspecified pronoun

1 Introduction

Adjectives such as *different*, *same* or *other* express similarity and difference (they will henceforth be called *sidi* terms): they make a comparison between elements. For instance in (1), *different* compares Lucie (the compared element) with Claire (the standard).

- (1) Lucie is different from Claire.

These adjectives appear in various constructions as illustrated below with French *différent*. The first group of constructions involves a linker (e.g. *de* 'from', *que* 'than, as, that') and the standard (underlined) is at least partially explicit.

- (1)' Lucie est différente de Claire.
'Lucie is different from Claire.'¹
- (2) J'ai vu un film différent de ce film-là.
'I watched a movie different from this one.'
- (3) Paul a vu un film différent de ce que proposait Marie.
'Paul watched a different movie than what Marie proposed.'
- (4) Paul a vu un film différent de Marie.
'Paul watched a different movie than Marie.'
- (5) J'ai regardé un film différent d'hier.
'I watched a different movie than yesterday.'

The second set of constructions does not exhibit any linker. In this case, the standard is implicit and can be retrieved based on sentence-external elements (underlined in (6)-(7)) or sentence-internal ones (underlined in (8)-(13)).

- (6) Lucie est allée voir Frida hier. Moi, j'ai vu un film différent.
'Lucie watched Frida yesterday. As for me, I watched a different movie.'
- (7) [Watching a trailer] C'est un film différent que j'avais vu.
'It is a different movie that I had watched.'
- (8) Ces films sont différents.
'These movies are different.'

¹ Throughout the article, I will provide English translations that are as close as possible to the French sentences to make the French structure transparent. Note that I will not specify grammaticality judgments for the English translations, but only for the French sentences.

- (9) J'ai vu des films différents pendant les vacances.
'I watched different movies during the holidays.'
- (10) Les critiques ont vu des films différents.
'The critics watched different movies.'
- (11) Par rapport à la semaine dernière, chaque enfant est différent aujourd'hui.
'As compared to last week, each child is different today.'
- (12) Chaque critique a vu un film différent.
'Each critic watched a different movie.'
- (13) Paul et Claire ont vu un film différent.
'Paul and Claire watched a different movie.'

To the best of my knowledge, most previous analyses (e.g. Heim: 1985, Dowty: 1985, Carlson: 1987, Moltmann: 1992, Barker: 2007) concentrate on so-called internal readings such as (10), (12) and (13) and propose specific mechanisms to account for them without relating them to the other cases or to other expressions of the language. A few studies (e.g. Beck: 2000, Brasoveanu: 2011) relate some of these constructions to each other, but not all of them: they assume the existence of several lexical entries for e.g. *different*. Moreover, the previous accounts usually focus on a single *sidi* term (mostly *same* or *different*).

The goal of this paper is to present a uniform analysis for all these constructions in French, which does not appeal to specific mechanisms: I will commit myself to a single lexical entry for each *sidi* term - *différent*, *même* and *autre*, and derive the diversity of constructions from mechanisms that are already necessary to account for other elements of the language, i.e. relational terms and comparatives. Beyond theoretical economy, the main motivation for this enterprise is empirical: in many languages from different language families that I have surveyed (see appendix), a single word is used for *same* under all its uses.

In a nutshell, the variety of constructions will be derived from the presence of silent structures. In particular, I hypothesize that *sidi* terms are relational adjectives that can be complemented by comparative clauses, and these comparative clauses can be partially or fully elided. This hypothesis will be supported by the behavior of *sidi* terms in islands.

As a preview, here is the gist of the analysis. *Différent* is a relational adjective that selects two individuals, just like other relational terms (e.g. *enemy*, *neighbor*). The first individual (the compared element) is projected as a DP and the second one (the standard) can correspond to a DP or a CP just like comparatives; a preposition (linker) occurs between the DP/CP and the *sidi* term as is standard with relational terms (e.g.

enemy of, far from). Moreover, the standard can be partially or completely silent: the comparative clause can be elided, and the DP can be silent and underspecified so that it is pragmatically interpreted as a pronoun, a reflexive or a reciprocal as is the case with relational terms or some elements like French clitic *se* or pronouns.

The combination of these ingredients yields constructions (1)-(13) in the following way; *X* symbolizes a silent DP and the index shows its salient pragmatic interpretation. (1)-(3) simply involve explicit DPs as standards, but in (6)-(11), the standard is a silent DP that is underspecified and can be pragmatically interpreted as a pronoun, a reciprocal or a reflexive.

(6)' Lucie est allée voir *Frida* hier. Moi, j'ai vu un film différent ~~de~~ *X*_{pronoun(anaphoric)}.
'Lucie watched *Frida* yesterday. As for me, I watched a different movie ~~from~~ *X*_{pronoun(anaphoric)}.'

(7)' [Watching a trailer] C'est un film différent ~~de~~ *X*_{pronoun(deictic)} que j'avais vu.
'It is a different movie ~~from~~ *X*_{pronoun(deictic)} that I had watched.'

(8)' Ces films sont différents ~~de~~ *X*_{reciprocal}.
'These movies are different ~~from~~ *X*_{reciprocal}.'

(9)' J'ai vu des films différents ~~de~~ *X*_{reciprocal} pendant les vacances.
'I watched different movies ~~from~~ *X*_{reciprocal} during the holidays.'

(10)' Les critiques ont vu des films différents ~~de~~ *X*_{reciprocal}.
'The critics watched different movies ~~from~~ *X*_{reciprocal}.'

(11)' Par rapport à la semaine dernière, chaque enfant est différent ~~de~~ *X*_{reflexive} aujourd'hui.
'As compared to last week, each child is different ~~from~~ *X*_{reflexive} today.'

As for (4)-(5), they contain partially elided comparative clauses that resemble regular comparative clauses except that they involve individuals instead of degrees.

(4)' Paul a vu un film différent de [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ Marie ~~a vu wh-film~~].
'Paul watched a different movie than [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ Marie ~~watched wh-movie~~].

(5)' J'ai regardé un film différent de [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ j'ai regardé ~~wh-film~~ hier].
'I watched a different movie than [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ I watched ~~wh-movie~~ yesterday].'

Finally, (12)-(13) include fully elided comparative clauses that contain silent underspecified DPs.

(12)' Chaque critique a vu un film différent de [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ *X*_{reciprocal} ~~a vu wh-film~~].

'Each critic watched a different movie ~~than~~ [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ X_{reciprocal} ~~watched wh-movie~~].'

(13)' Paul et Claire ont vu un film différent ~~de~~ [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ X_{reciprocal} ~~ont vu wh-film~~].

'Paul and Claire watched a different movie ~~than~~ [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ X_{reciprocal} ~~watched wh-movie~~].'

The analysis of each case will be explained in more detail in section 2 for French *différent*. I will start with the cases where the standard is projected as a DP, explicit or silent (section 2.1.) and then examine those where the standard is projected as a CP (section 2.2.); in particular, it will be shown how island facts support the hypothesis of the presence of elided comparative clauses. Then in section 3, we will see how this analysis can extend to the cases of French *même* ('same') and *autre* ('other'). Finally, we will examine further issues (section 4) and briefly compare the present analysis with previous ones (section 5).

2 *Différent*

I assume that under all constructions, *différent* is a relational adjective that combines with two individuals; this is transparent in (1)'.²

(1)' Lucie est différente de Claire.
'Lucie is different from Claire.'

Note that in this paper, I am not specifically interested in what it means to consider two entities as different, but in the distribution of *différent*. Based on Alrenga (2007), I will simply assume that difference and similarity are measured in terms of shared or distinguishing properties.² One way to implement this idea is as follows (C is a set of contextually relevant properties P):

(14) $\llbracket \textit{différent} \rrbracket = \lambda x. \lambda y. \exists P \in C, P(x)=1 \text{ and } P(y)=0$

My hypothesis is that the variety of constructions involving *différent* does not come from the existence of several lexical entries for *différent*, but derives from the various forms that the two elements of comparison take. In particular, we will see that the standard can project as a DP (section 2.1.) or a CP (section 2.2.).

² As noted by a reviewer, the following examples show that *différent* does not only care about the non-identity of objects (or types), but also about distinguishing properties.

(i) When it comes to likes and dislikes, Lucie is the same as Claire. With respect to desires, however, Lucie is completely different from Claire.

(ii) Lucie is simultaneously the same as and different from Claire, though with respect to distinct properties.

2.1 Standard as DP

2.1.1 Standard as explicit DP (case noted 'from DP')

In (1)', both the compared element and the standard are full DPs (i.e. *Lucie, Claire*). As is common with relational terms (cf. (15)), a preposition (here *de* 'from') links *différent* and the standard.

- (15) Lucie est proche de Claire.
'Lucie is close to Claire.'

Moreover, *différent* is predicative in (1)' but can also be attributive and occur within the DP denoting the compared element just like other relational terms (e.g. *voisin* 'neighbor' in (16)).

- (2) J'ai vu un film différent de ce film-là.
'I watched a movie different from this one.'
- (16) J'ai visité une ville voisine de cette ville-là.
'I visited a town nearby this one.'

In that case, I simply assume that *différent* is to be analyzed as a reduced relative clause (cf. Cinque 2010) and (2) basically corresponds to *I watched a movie that is different from this one*. Nothing hinges on this particular assumption: any account of (16) can simply extend to (2).

(3) is similar to (2) except that the standard includes a relative clause headed by *ce* 'this, that'.

- (3) Paul a vu un film différent de ce que proposait Marie.
'Paul watched a different movie than what Marie proposed.'

Note that we find all three cases not only with relational terms as shown above, but also with regular comparatives as exemplified below.

- (17) Lucie est plus bronzée que Claire.
'Lucie is more tanned than Claire.'
- (18) J'ai vu un film plus intéressant que ce film-là.
'I watched a more interesting movie than this one.'
- (19) Paul a vu un film plus intéressant que ce que proposait Marie.
'Paul watched a more interesting movie than what Marie proposed.'

Thus *différent* resembles both relational adjectives and comparatives. As a matter of fact, it can combine with two kinds of linker: *de* ('of, from'), which is often used with relational adjectives, and *que* ('than, that'), which is the linker used with comparatives; the latter option (cf. (3)'' below) is more colloquial and is not used by all speakers of French. In the rest of the paper, we will simply use *de* with *différent* for simplicity.

- (3)'' % Paul a vu un film différent que ce que proposait Marie.
'Paul watched a different movie than what Marie proposed.'

2.1.2 Standard as implicit DP (case noted 'from X')

Furthermore, the DP complement of *différent* can be implicit and underspecified as is the case with comparatives and relational terms. Depending on the context, this yields a range of different interpretations.

Interpretation of the implicit standard as a pronoun (noted 'from X_{pronoun}')

First, so-called external readings such as (6)' and (7)' can be accounted for if we suppose that the silent standard is interpreted as an anaphoric or deictic pronoun.

- (6)' Lucie est allée voir *Frida* hier. Moi, j'ai vu un film différent ~~de~~ X_{pronoun(anaphoric)}.
'Lucie watched *Frida* yesterday. As for me, I watched a different movie ~~from~~ X_{pronoun(anaphoric)}.'

- (7)' [Watching a trailer] C'est un film différent ~~de~~ X_{pronoun(deictic)} que j'avais vu.
'It is a different ~~from~~ X_{pronoun(deictic)} movie that I had watched.'

In (6)', *différent* compares the movie that the speaker watched with *Frida*, a movie mentioned in the previous sentence: *Frida* is a sentence-external element, which appears in the preceding discourse. In (7)', the movie that the speaker had watched is contrasted with a movie represented in a trailer, as mentioned in the context: the element of comparison is here deictically referred to. In other words, the reference of the standard is determined by the discourse in (6)' and the extralinguistic context in (7)': the implicit element is thus interpreted as an anaphoric pronoun and a deictic pronoun respectively.

No specific mechanism needs to be stipulated to account for that since the same holds with relational terms (cf. *voisin* 'neighbor, nearby' in (20)) and comparatives (cf. *plus récent* 'more recent' in (21)).

- (20) a. Lucie est allée visiter Orléans hier. Moi, j'ai visité une ville voisine.
'Lucie visited Orléans yesterday. As for me, I visited a nearby town.'
b. [Visiting Orléans] Moi je préférerais aller visiter une ville voisine.

'I would prefer to visit a nearby town.'

- (21) a. Lucie est allée voir *Frida* hier. Moi, j'ai vu un film plus récent.
'Lucie watched *Frida* yesterday. As for me, I watched a more recent movie.'
b. [*Watching a trailer*] C'est un film plus récent que j'avais vu.
'It is a more recent movie that I had watched.'

Interpretation of the implicit standard as a reflexive (noted 'from $X_{\text{reflexive}}$ ')

In particular situations like (11)', the silent standard can be interpreted as a reflexive.

- (11)' Par rapport à la semaine dernière, chaque enfant est différent ~~de~~ $X_{\text{reflexive}}$ aujourd'hui.

'As compared to last week, each child is different ~~from~~ $X_{\text{reflexive}}$ today.'

(11)' means that each child is different from herself today, i.e. from the way she was last week.

Again, the same is attested with relational terms like *identique* 'identical' in (22) or *voisin* 'neighbor' in (23), and with comparatives in specific contexts like (24).³

- (22) Le ciel est identique (à $X_{\text{reflexive}}$) aujourd'hui.
'The sky is identical (~~to~~ $X_{\text{reflexive}}$) today.'

- (23) (*Context: A couple owns two apartments that are next to each other*)
Ils sont voisins (~~de~~ $X_{\text{reflexive}}$) !
'They are neighbors (~~of~~ $X_{\text{reflexive}}$)!'

- (24) a. Par rapport à hier, cette robe a l'air plus/moins élégante (~~que~~ $X_{\text{reflexive}}$) aujourd'hui.
'As compared to yesterday, this dress looks more/less elegant (~~than~~ $X_{\text{reflexive}}$) today.'
b. Par rapport à hier, cette robe n'a pas l'air aussi élégante (~~que~~ $X_{\text{reflexive}}$) aujourd'hui.
'As compared to yesterday, this dress does not look as elegant (~~as~~ $X_{\text{reflexive}}$) today.'

Interpretation of the implicit standard as a reciprocal (noted 'from $X_{\text{reciprocal}}$ ')

Similarly, a reciprocal interpretation can obtain whether *différent* is predicative as in (8)' or attributive as in (9)':

³ An overt reflexive makes the sentence degraded in all these cases – relational terms, comparatives and *sidi* terms. This is an independent issue, which is not specific to *sidi* terms (see footnote 6).

(8) ' Ces films sont différents ~~de~~ X_{reciprocal}.
'These movies are different ~~from~~ X_{reciprocal}.'

(9) ' J'ai vu des films différents ~~de~~ X_{reciprocal} pendant les vacances.
'I watched different movies ~~from~~ X_{reciprocal} during the holidays.'

This is again comparable to what we find with relational terms like *similaire* 'similar' in (25), *voisin* 'neighbor' in (26), or *ennemi* 'enemy' in (27).

(25) a. J'ai acheté trois robes similaires.
'I bought three similar dresses.'
b. Ces trois robes sont similaires (l'une à l'autre).
'These three dresses are similar (to each other).'

(26) a. J'ai visité des villes voisines.
'I visited nearby cities.'
b. Ces villes sont voisines (l'une de l'autre).
'These cities are nearby (each other).'

(27) a. Il s'agit de deux pays ennemis.
'These are two enemy countries.'
b. Ces deux pays sont ennemis (l'un de l'autre).
'These two countries are enemies (of each other).'

More on the underspecification of the silent standard

The fact that *sidi* terms are similar to relational terms in licensing the interpretation of the implicit argument as a pronoun, a reflexive or a reciprocal is crucial: it means that the analysis of *sidi* terms does not require any *ad hoc* mechanism, but we simply need to suppose that what happens with any relational term applies to *sidi* terms. In particular, I hypothesize that the implicit argument of relational terms or *sidi* terms is underspecified and the specific interpretation is constrained pragmatically. Thus, these different interpretations correspond to the same configuration and all interpretations (as a pronoun, a reflexive, a reciprocal or even a vaguer interpretation that is neither strongly reciprocal nor strongly reflexive) are in principle possible, but pragmatics will usually eliminate at least some of them based on salience and plausibility.

To illustrate the kind of underspecification I am appealing to, consider constructions with the reflexive clitic *se* in French. The first sentence below presents various interpretations:

(28) a. Les enfants se regardent.
'The children are looking at each other/themselves.'
b. Les enfants se jalourent.

'The children are jealous of each other/themselves.'

If we suppose that a mirror is present in the context, the first sentence is compatible with a situation where each child is looking at himself, or all children are looking at themselves in the mirror (reflexive interpretation, distributive or not). But it can also be uttered in a situation where each child is looking at all the others (a strict reciprocal interpretation). Moreover, the sentence can express a mix of both situations: some children are looking at themselves, others are looking at other children (vague interpretation). It can even receive a vaguer interpretation where some children do not do anything (provided that most of them are looking at each other/themselves) or/and some of them are both looking at themselves and at some other children, etc... In other words, it has a very vague meaning paraphrasable as: "the children are looking at the children", which is deemed to be true in reciprocal, distributive reflexive, and all sorts of other intermediate situations. Note that this is sensitive to the choice of verb as shown by (28)b with the verb *jalouser* ('be jealous of'). In this sentence a reflexive interpretation, while not incompatible with the lexical meaning of the verb (one can be jealous of oneself, e.g. one former self), is very difficult to get if it is not made explicit.

Here, I apply the underspecification that we observe with the French clitic *se* to the silent complement of both relational terms and *sidi* terms. This underspecified pronoun gets its reference in various ways constrained by pragmatics yielding the reflexive, reciprocal and vague interpretations.

To be more precise, let's for instance examine the following sentence:

- (29) J'ai vu vingt films différents pendant les vacances.
'I watched twenty different movies during the holidays.'

In principle, the silent complement of *différent*, that I hypothesize to be underspecified, can be interpreted in several ways: if there was a salient movie in the context, it could be interpreted as a pronoun referring to this movie (external reading) or have an external reading mimicking a reflexive interpretation if twenty movies were previously introduced all in color, and the sentence is talking about these same movies but all in black and white (so the movies are different from themselves); without any context and given that the DP containing *différent* is plural, it can easily be interpreted as a reciprocal; a reflexive reading (e.g. I watched twenty movies globally different from themselves, or each different from itself) seems hardly accessible much the same way that such interpretation is hardly accessible with *se* and the verb *jalouser* above because one is typically not jealous or different from oneself; finally, we could imagine that the interpretation is vaguer, neither strictly reciprocal nor strictly reflexive, but some movies are different from others and some movies are different from themselves (e.g. the same movie is in the list, once in color and once in black and white). In this very sentence, these four interpretations are not available due to pragmatic constraints (salience and

plausibility) but we have seen examples of all four interpretations. Note finally that this behavior of *different* parallels that of the relational noun *ennemi* 'enemy' in (27): while it is possible in principle to be one's own enemy, it is unusual and a reflexive interpretation of (27) is hardly accessible (except by making it explicit).

Comparison with comparatives

We observed that comparatives can also be complemented by silent elements that can be interpreted as anaphoric or deictic pronouns in (21) and reflexives in particular situations like (24):

- (21) a. Lucie est allée voir *Frida* hier. Moi, j'ai vu un film plus récent.
'Lucie watched *Frida* yesterday. As for me, I watched a more recent movie.'
b. [*Watching a trailer*] C'est un film plus récent que j'avais vu.
'It is a more recent movie that I had watched.'
- (24) a. Aujourd'hui, cette robe a l'air plus/moins élégante.
'Today, this dress looks more/less elegant.'
b. Aujourd'hui, cette robe n'a pas l'air aussi élégante.
'Today, this dress does not look as elegant.'

Reflexive interpretations are possible only if the same elements are compared at different times (the presence of *aujourd'hui* 'today' licenses this interpretation in (24)). Reciprocal interpretations are however unavailable: whether we deal with comparatives of superiority/inferiority as in (30) or equatives as in (31), the silent complement can only be interpreted as a pronoun, not as a reciprocal.

- (30) a. #_{reciprocal} J'ai mis des robes plus/moins élégantes pendant les vacances.
'I put on more/less elegant dresses during the holidays.'
b. #_{reciprocal} Ces robes sont plus/moins élégantes.
'These dresses are more/less elegant.'
- (31) a. ??_{reciprocal} J'ai mis des robes aussi élégantes pendant les vacances.
'I put on dresses as elegant during the holidays.'
b. ?_{reciprocal} Ces robes sont aussi élégantes.
'These dresses are as elegant.'

This difference between comparatives and *sidi* or relational terms is due to the meaning of comparatives. Reciprocals require a symmetrical meaning, while inferiority and superiority comparatives (cf. (30)) are obviously not symmetrical. Furthermore, standard semantic accounts of equatives ascribe them an 'at least' meaning, deriving an 'exactly' reading when necessary via scalar implicature (cf. Rett: 2010 for discussion). This means that equatives are not inherently symmetrical, but only get a symmetrical

meaning through implicature. I propose that this accounts for the intermediate judgment of sentence-internal readings of equatives (cf. (31)). Similarly, the meaning of comparatives makes reflexive interpretations hardly accessible except in contexts like (24) where time introduces an order and the same element can be compared to itself at different times.

Special case of reciprocal interpretation

Consider again the following sentence:

- (10)' Les critiques ont vu des films différents.
'The critics watched different movies.'

Just like (9)', it can mean that the critics watched different types of movies, i.e. movies that are different from each other. The silent standard is here interpreted as a reciprocal.

- (9)' J'ai vu des films différents ~~de~~ $X_{\text{reciprocal}}$ pendant les vacances.
'I watched different ~~from~~ $X_{\text{reciprocal}}$ movies during the holidays.'

But (10)' exhibits another salient interpretation: each critic (or each subgroup of critics) watched a movie different from the movies watched by the other critics (or subgroups of critics). This interpretation has often been considered as a different reading. But here following Beck's (2000) analysis of German *verschieden* ('different'), I suppose that the apparent difference between this interpretation (each critic watched different movies than the other critics) and the previous one (each critic watched movies that are different from each other) is pragmatic: the difference in interpretation comes from the availability of different covers (a cover C of a set S is a set of subsets of S such that every member of S belongs to some set in C and \emptyset is not in C; see Schwarzschild: 1996 for more details). Indeed several possible covers of the movies in question can be pragmatically determined based on salience: depending on what is pertinent in the context, the movies can be divided into different kinds of subparts (the classification can be based on different criteria, e.g. the type of movies, the producer, the date, the length, the people who watch them...etc). For example in (10)', if the salient cover divides movies according to their kinds (e.g. comedies and cartoons), this will give rise to the first interpretation I mentioned. The second interpretation obtains when the partition is made along the dimension of the viewers {movies watched by a subgroup of critics, movies watched by another subgroup...}. According to Beck (2000: 113-125) based on Schwarzschild (1996), a free variable ranging over covers appears at LF whenever there is a * (distributive) operator: the free variable Cov occurs in the sister of the * operator and it is interpreted intersectively with a predicate.⁴

⁴ This explains why the presence of *différent* – a predicate – is crucial to activate the cover-based interpretation: Cov needs to occur in the sister of a distributive operator, which has to scope over a predicate. This is why as noted by an anonymous reviewer, (10)' is a reasonable answer to (iii), but (iv) is

- (10)'' Les critiques ont vu des films [* [Cov différents [de X]]].
 'The critics watched movies [* [Cov different [from X]]].'

This interpretation is even more salient in the presence of a coordination that makes the partition more explicit:

- (32) Paul et Claire ont vu des films différents.
 'Paul and Claire watched different movies.'

The following interpretation is here salient: the movie that Paul watched is different from the movie that Claire watched.

This analysis correctly predicts that vague interpretations are possible (if the relevant covers are available).⁵ Thus (10)' does not constrain a strict distribution of the movies across each critic: it may be the case that some critics watched the same movie; it just means that the cover is slightly different in this case (the subgroups of critics can be singleton sets or not).

As mentioned by Beck (2000: 126-127), the pragmatic account of this reading correctly predicts (in German in (33) and in French in (34)) that it is also possible when the two DPs are separated by a scope island since it is not syntactically, but pragmatically driven. The importance of this consequence will be made clearer later on in the article.

- (33) a. Die Bücher, die Franck und Bärbel mögen, sind verschieden. (Beck, 2000: 126)
 'The books that Frank and Bärbel like are different.'
 b. Otilie und Maria haben Bücher gelesen, die zu verschiedenen Schlüssen kamen. (Beck, 2000: 127)
 'Otilie and Maria read books that came to different conclusions.'
- (34) a. Les films que Paul et Claire ont vus sont différents.
 'The movies that Paul and Claire watched are different.'
 b. Paul et Claire ont vu des films qui menaient à des conclusions différentes.

not: there is no predicate in (iv) that can license the presence of a distributive operator and a cover variable which would distribute over movies.

(iii) Pourquoi est-ce qu'aucun film n'a été commenté par deux critiques ou plus ?

'Why was no movie written about by 2 or more critics?'

(iv) Les critiques ont vu des films. 'The critics saw movies.'

⁵ As mentioned by Carlson (1987) and Beck (2000), there is even one case where *différent* seems to be semantically vacuous: this is when the salient cover divides the relevant plural into singularities without appealing to salient criteria of division other than the fact of being distinct objects.

(v) John went to five different plays. (from Beck, 2000: 125)

Under one interpretation, the five plays are only different in that there are distinct plays. I suspect that the role played by *different* here relies on information structure: by redundancy, it emphasizes the fact that there are several plays at stake, not just one.

'Paul and Claire watched movies that came to different conclusions.'

To sum up, several interpretations arise depending on the context when the standard is projected as a DP because it can be implicit and underspecified. Here is a summary of the main cases.

Case	Example
Standard as overt DP (‘from DP’)	(1) 'Lucie est différente de Claire. 'Lucie is different from Claire.' (2) J'ai vu un film différent de ce film-là. 'I watched a movie different from this one.' (3) Paul a vu un film différent de ce que proposait Marie. 'Paul watched a different movie than what Marie proposed.'
Standard as implicit DP (‘from X’) X is underspecified and can in particular be interpreted as a pronoun, a reflexive or a reciprocal.	(6) 'Lucie est allée voir <i>Frida</i> hier. Moi, j'ai vu un film différent de X. 'Lucie went and watched <i>Frida</i> yesterday. As for me, I watched a different movie from X.' (7) [<i>Watching a trailer</i>] C'est un film différent de X que j'avais vu. 'It is a different from X movie that I had watched.' (8) 'Ces films sont différents de X. 'These movies are different from X.' (9) J'ai vu des films différents de X pendant les vacances. 'I watched different movies from X during the holidays.' (10) 'Les critiques ont vu des films différents de X. 'The critics watched different movies.' (11) 'Par rapport à la semaine dernière, chaque enfant est différent de X aujourd'hui. 'As compared to last week, each child is different from X today.'

Table 1: Standard as DP

2.2 Standard as CP

A second set of interpretations arises when the standard is projected as a CP: I hypothesize that like regular comparatives, *sidi* terms can be complemented by a comparative clause; as this section will show, this hypothesis is based on similarities between comparatives and *sidi* terms and on island facts that argue for the presence of a silent clause. Different cases obtain depending on how much the comparative clause is elided and how the silent elements are interpreted.

2.2.1 Standard as partially elided CP (case noted ‘than [_{CP} remnant]’)

First, a fully overt comparative clause (except for the compared element) is not acceptable with *sidi* terms (cf. (35)), just as in the case of any comparative in French (cf. (36)) unlike English.

(35) *Paul a vu un film différent de Marie a vu.

'Paul watched a different movie than Marie watched.'

(36) *Paul a vu un film plus intéressant que Marie a vu.

'Paul watched a more interesting movie than Marie watched.'

The comparative clause has to be at least partially elided. The following examples (cf. (4)'-(5)') contain a reduced comparative clause complementing *différent* through the preposition *de* or *que* 'than' as is the case with regular comparatives (cf. (37)-(38)).

(4)' Paul a vu un film différent de Marie.

'Paul watched a different movie than Marie.'

(5)' J'ai regardé un film différent d'hier.

'I watched a different movie than yesterday.'

(37) Paul a vu un film plus intéressant que Marie.

'Paul watched a more interesting movie than Marie.'

(38) J'ai regardé un film plus intéressant qu'hier.

'I watched a more interesting movie than yesterday.'

Note that the complement of *différent de* 'different than' seems to be a DP as in previous cases like (2)'.

(2) J'ai vu un film différent de ce film-là.

'I watched a movie different from this one.'

But the complement DP in (2) directly corresponds to the standard (*ce film-là* 'this movie') as opposed to (4)' where the movie is not directly compared to Marie, but to the movie watched by Marie. Moreover in (5)', the phrase appearing after *différent de*, namely *hier* 'yesterday', does not denote an individual; the movie cannot be compared to yesterday, but to the movie that I watched yesterday. Furthermore, multiple phrases can occur after *différent que/de* as shown in (39).

(39) Paul a vu un film différent de Marie hier.

'Paul watched a different movie than Marie yesterday.'

That's why I hypothesize that examples such as (4)' or (5)' are reduced clauses (we will discuss in section 5.1.1 whether examples like (2) can also be reduced to such cases), just as has been proposed for regular comparatives such as (37) or (38).

The only difference between *différent* and regular comparatives comes from the fact that *différent* involves a comparison between individuals, not degrees. Accordingly, I assume

that the comparative clause does not denote a maximal degree (cf. a.o. Kennedy 1999), but an individual: just like a free relative clause, the comparative clause corresponds to a definite description (cf. a.o. Caponigro: 2004 for more detail about free relatives). Otherwise, I simply assume that the analysis of regular comparatives can be applied to these cases.

More precisely, I suppose like most analyses (cf. a.o. Hankamer 1973, Chomsky 1977, Heim 2000, Kennedy 2002) that comparative clauses involve *wh*-movement of the compared element in the Specifier of CP.

- (4)' Paul a vu un film différent de [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ Marie ~~a vu wh-film~~].
'Paul watched a different movie than [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ Marie ~~watched wh-movie~~].'

- (5)' J'ai regardé un film différent de [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ j'ai regardé ~~wh-film~~ hier].
'I watched a different movie than [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ I watched ~~wh-movie~~ yesterday].'

Moreover, the elided part of the comparative clause (e.g. the VP in (4)') is retrieved through identity of the antecedent (e.g. the matrix VP in (4)') as in any case of ellipsis. Since the VP antecedent seems to contain the elided VP ([_{VP} watched a different movie than Marie [_{VP} ~~watched~~ ...]]), we need to apply Quantifier Raising (QR) to avoid infinite regression (cf. a.o. Kennedy 1997) as illustrated below: antecedent containment is standardly resolved via movement and copying/deletion of identical material from the matrix clause in the ellipsis site (henceforth ACD, for Antecedent Contained Deletion). Note that I here suppose that the trace contains the content of the NP, but any other alternative analysis could be applied here since this issue is independent of the present analysis.

- (4)' [un film différent de [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ Marie ~~a vu wh-film~~]] Paul a vu film.
'a different movie than [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ Marie ~~watched wh-movie~~] Paul watched movie.'

- (5)' [un film différent de [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ j'ai regardé ~~wh-film~~ hier]] j'ai regardé film.
'[a different movie than [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ I watched ~~wh-movie~~ yesterday]] I watched movie.'

Also, the remnant (e.g. *Marie* in (4)') needs to move to a clause-external (or clause-peripheral) position concomitant with clausal ellipsis. The necessity of this movement for ellipsis resolution is clearer when the remnant is in an object position as in (40).

- (40) A more important person met Pierre than Marie.

To guarantee identity between the antecedent and the ellipsis (*a person met x*), *Pierre* and *Marie* need to be replaced by a variable: I adopt the hypothesis (cf. a.o. Heim 1997)

that this happens through focus movement of *Pierre* and *Marie*. This is represented below in a simplified way, but note that for simplicity, I will not represent this movement in most examples of the paper.

(40)'_[FOC Pierre] [a more important person [~~a person~~ met x]] than [_[FOC Marie] [~~a person~~-met x]].

Furthermore, I assume that as in the previous cases (cf. (2)), *différent* should be analyzed as a reduced relative clause (*a different movie (from)* amounts to *a movie that is different (from)*). Therefore, it combines as usual with two individuals in those examples: the first one is the DP combining with this reduced relative clause (*un film* 'a movie'); the second one is the comparative clause interpreted as a definite description like a free relative clause.

2.2.2 Standard as fully elided CP (case noted 'than [_{CP} X]')

Now, we have all the ingredients to account for the so-called sentence-internal readings salient in (12)' or (13)', which have received a lot of attention in the literature.

(12)' Chaque critique a vu un film différent.
'Each critic watched a different movie.'

(13)' Paul et Claire ont vu un film différent.
'Paul and Claire watched a different movie.'

We simply need to suppose that (12)' and (13)' have the same structure as (4)' except that the remnant (*Marie* in (4)') is the same underspecified element (noted as X) as that mentioned previously in section 2.1.2, which can be interpreted as a pronoun, a reflexive or a reciprocal depending on the pragmatic conditions.

(12)' Chaque critique a vu un film différent ~~de~~ [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ X ~~a vu wh-film~~].
'Each critic watched a different movie ~~than~~ [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ X ~~watched wh-movie~~].'

(13)' Paul et Claire ont vu un film différent ~~de~~ [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ X ~~ont vu wh-film~~].
'Paul and Claire watched a different movie ~~than~~ [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ X ~~watched wh-movie~~].'

Concentrating first on (13)', the underspecified element can indeed be interpreted in different ways:

(41) a. Lucie est allée voir *Frida*. Paul et Claire ont vu un film différent ~~de~~ [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ X_{pronoun(anaphoric)} ~~ont vu wh-film~~]. (X interpreted as 'Lucie')
'Lucie watched *Frida*. Paul and Claire watched a different movie ~~than~~ [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ X_{pronoun(anaphoric)} ~~watched wh-movie~~].'

b. Cette semaine, Paul et Claire ont vu un film différent de [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ X_{reflexive} ~~ont vu wh-film~~]. (X interpreted as 'themselves')

'This week, Paul and Claire watched a different movie than [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ X_{reflexive} ~~watched wh-movie~~].

c. Paul et Claire ont vu un film différent de [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ X_{reciprocal} ~~ont vu wh-film~~].
(X interpreted as 'each other')

'Paul and Claire watched a different movie than [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ X_{reciprocal} ~~watched wh-movie~~].

In a context like (41)a where someone else watched a movie in the context, X is preferably interpreted as a pronoun. In a situation like (41)b where Paul and Claire watched a movie at another time (e.g. last week), X is easily interpreted as a reflexive: they watched a movie different from the movie that they themselves watched the previous week. Finally, the easiest interpretation is the reciprocal one as in (41)c: Paul and Claire watched a different movie than each other.

The same holds with (12)': it can mean that each critic watched a different movie than someone mentioned in the previous context (cf. (42)a), than he himself did at another occasion (cf. (42)b)⁶ or than every other critic did (cf. (42)c).⁷

(42) a. Lucie est allée voir *Frida*. Chaque critique a vu un film différent de [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ X_{pronoun(anaphoric)} ~~a vu wh-film~~].

'Lucie watched *Frida*. Each critic watched a different movie than [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ X_{pronoun(anaphoric)} ~~watched wh-movie~~].'

b. Cette semaine, chaque critique a vu un film différent de [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ X_{reflexive} ~~a vu wh-film~~].

⁶ The same sentence (under the reflexive interpretation) is not acceptable when the silent underspecified pronoun is replaced by an explicit element, i.e. a reflexive or a bound pronoun as in (vi)a, unless the whole comparative clause is made overt as in (vi)b:

(vi) a. *Cette semaine, [chaque critique]_i a vu un film différent de lui-même_i /lui_i (la semaine dernière).

'This week, [each critic]_i watched a different movie than himself/him_i (last week).'

b. Cette semaine, [chaque critique]_i a vu un film différent de celui qu'il_i a vu la semaine dernière).

'This week, [each critic]_i watched a different movie than what he_i watched last week.'

It is not clear exactly why this is so, but this problem is independent of the specific behavior of *sidi* terms since the same holds with regular comparatives:

(vii) a. *Cette semaine, Paul_i a vu un plus beau film que lui-même/lui_i (la semaine dernière).

'This week, Paul_i watched a more beautiful movie than himself/him_i (last week).'

b. Cette semaine, Paul_i a vu un plus beau film que celui qu'il_i a vu la semaine dernière.

'This week, Paul_i watched a more beautiful movie than he_i watched last week.'

Note that it is known (cf. Partee 1989) that in general, implicit arguments behave differently from explicit elements.

⁷ Unlike the reflexive interpretation (cf. previous footnote), the reciprocal interpretation can be paraphrased with an explicit element, i.e. *les autres* 'the others':

(viii) Chaque critique a vu un film différent des autres.

'Each critic watched a different movie than the others.'

'This week, each critic watched a different movie ~~than~~ [CP ~~wh-movie~~ X_{reflexive} ~~watched wh-movie~~].'

c. Chaque critique a vu un film différent ~~de~~ [CP ~~wh-film~~ X_{reciprocal} ~~a-vu wh-film~~].

'Each critic watched a different movie ~~than~~ [CP ~~wh-movie~~ X_{reciprocal} ~~watched wh-movie~~].'

This variety of interpretations is independently attested with the overt plural pronoun *ils* ('they'), which is underspecified in the following sentences:

(43) a. Paul et Pierre ont dit qu'ils étaient malades.

'Paul and Pierre said that they were sick.'

b. (*speaking of a group of students*) Chacun a dit qu'ils étaient malades.

'Each one said that they were sick.'

Whether the antecedent is a conjunct (as in (43)a), or a quantifier (as in (43)b), the plural pronoun *ils* ('they') is vague and can be interpreted in different ways. For instance in (43)a, Paul may have said that some people salient in the context are sick, that he himself is sick, that both Pierre and himself are sick or that Pierre is sick; the same holds for Pierre (the only requirement - because of the plural - seems to be that both of them have been said to be sick). Similarly, (43)b requires that every student said something about the sickness of people, but he may have said that some salient people were sick, that he was sick himself, that all the (other) students were sick or only some of them (including himself or not).

Thus in particular, each sentence licences a strict reciprocal interpretation just as under the salient interpretation of (12)' and (13)' involving *sidi* terms. This is even clearer in the following sentences:

(44) a. Paul et Pierre espèrent qu'ils iront à leur enterrement.

'Paul and Pierre hope that they will come to their funeral.'

b. (*speaking of a group of friends*) Chacun espère qu'ils iront à son enterrement.

'Each one hopes that they will come to his funeral.'

Here, the pronoun *ils* ('they') can clearly be interpreted as a reciprocal, since one cannot go to one's own funeral:⁸ (44)a can mean that Paul and Pierre each hope that the other will come to his funeral, and (44)b that each one hopes that the others will come to his funeral.

Distributivity of the licenser

The reciprocal interpretation is however subject to some constraints because it requires a plural object so that its members can be compared to each other: for instance in (12)'

⁸ If *leur* 'their' is interpreted as a reciprocal in (44)a, *ils* 'they' can be interpreted as a reflexive. The truth conditions are of course different.

and (13)', several movies have to be compared to each other. Since the DP containing *différent* can be singular under this reading (cf. a.o. *un film différent* 'a different movie' in (12)' and (13)'), this means that it has to be interpreted within the scope of a distributive operator so that *un film différent* 'a different movie' can denote a potentially different movie for every choice of the critics distributed over. This obtains – as is standard with any indefinite – if it is outscoped by a quantificational or plural DP (henceforth, licenser) that is suitable.

Indeed, a non-quantificational singular licenser (underlined below) only licenses a pronominal or reflexive interpretation.

(45) Paul a vu un film différent.

'Paul watched a different movie.' (i.e. from some other movie, than someone else did, than he himself did at another time)

A quantificational DP can however yield a distributive interpretation of the indefinite containing *différent* if it c-commands it at LF (this holds for both reciprocal and reflexive interpretations). Indeed, the internal reading does not obtain when the licenser cannot QR and does not c-command *différent* at surface structure as is the case with some quantifiers like modified numerals (cf. a.o. Szabolcsi: 1997) such as *plus de trois films* 'more than three movies' as in (47)b. Thus (46) – where the licenser *chaque film* 'each movie' can QR – and (47)a – where the licenser *plus de trois critiques* 'more than three critics' c-commands *différent* at surface structure – contrast with (47)b where neither occurs.

(46) Un critique différent a vu chaque film.⁹

'A different critic watched each movie.'

(47) a. Cette semaine, plus de trois critiques ont vu un film différent.

'This week, more than three critics watched a different movie.'

b. # Un critique différent a vu plus de trois films.

'# A different critic watched more than three movie.'

⁹ Unlike the case where *différent* occurs in a object DP (cf. footnote 7), this example – where it is contained within a subject – cannot be paraphrased using an explicit element:

(ix) *Un critique différent des autres (films) a vu chaque film.

'*A different critic than the other (movies) watched each movie.'

This problem is independent of *sidi* terms since the same contrasts are observed with regular comparatives: compare (x)a with (ix), (x)b with (viii) and (x)c with (46).

(x) a. *Un étudiant plus intelligent que cette équation a résolu ce problème.

'*A smarter student than this equation solved this problem.'

(intended meaning: a smarter student than the student that solved this equation solved this problem)

b. Cet étudiant a résolu un problème plus difficile que ce professeur.

'This student solved a harder problem than this teacher.'

c. Un étudiant plus intelligent a résolu chaque nouveau problème.

'A smarter student solved each new problem.'

Concerning plural licensors, the requirement for them to license a distributive interpretation in French is that the licensor can easily be partitioned:¹⁰ this is so in the presence of *tous* 'all' (cf. (48)a), the conjunction *et* 'and' (cf. (48)b), or numerals (cf. (48)c).

- (48) a. Tous les critiques ont vu un film différent.
'All the critics watched a different movie.'
- b. Paul et Claire ont vu un film différent.
'Paul and Claire watched a different movie.'
- c. Les trois critiques ont vu un film différent.
'The three critics watched a different movie.'

However, the reciprocal interpretation is harder to obtain if the licensor is a simple plural definite as in (49), unless the partition of the licensor is made explicit as in (50).

- (49) ?_{reciprocal} Les critiques ont vu un film différent.
'The critics watched a different movie.'
- (50) a. Les quatre critiques n'ont pas les mêmes goûts, alors ils ont choisi de voir un film différent.
'The four critics do not have the same tastes, so they chose to watch a different movie.'
- b. C'est normal que tu ne comprennes pas ce que je dis, on a vu un film différent !
'Of course you don't understand what I am saying, we saw a different movie!'

In (50)a, the simple plural *ils* 'they' referring to the critics licenses a reciprocal interpretation because the previous discourse specifies that there are four distinct critics. In (50)b, the simple plural *on* (colloquial equivalent to *nous* 'we') clearly composed of *me* 'me' and *tu* 'you' also licenses a reciprocal interpretation.

The difference between plain definite plurals and quantifiers or partitioned plurals in their capacity of licensing a reciprocal interpretation of *différent* is due to their different behavior with respect to distributivity. Below, we observe independent evidence showing that plural definites (in (51)) do not behave like quantifiers (in (52)-(53)), definites with numerals (in (54)) or coordinations (in (55)) with respect to distributivity: a continuation with a plural referring to the movies is not possible in (51), but it is in (52)-(53), (54) and (55).

- (51) a. *Les critiques ont vu un film. Ils ont tous duré plus de deux heures.
'The critics watched a movie. They all lasted more than two hours.'

¹⁰ See Laca and Tasmowski (2001) for a discussion on the relation between the distributivity of the licensor and the use of *sidi* terms.

b. *Les touristes ont interrogé un garde qui surveillait une salle de musée. Ils ont tous été serviables.

‘The tourists asked questions to a guard who was watching over a room of the museum. They were all helpful.’

(52) a. Chaque critique a vu un film. Ils ont tous duré plus de deux heures.

‘Each critic watched a movie. They all lasted more than two hours.’

b. Chaque touriste a interrogé un garde qui surveillait une salle de musée. Ils ont tous été serviables.

‘Each tourist asked questions to a guard who was watching over a room of the museum. They were all helpful.’

(53) a. Tous les critiques ont vu un film. Ils ont tous duré plus de deux heures.

‘All the critics watched a movie. They all lasted more than two hours.’

b. Tous les touristes ont interrogé un garde qui surveillait une salle de musée. Ils ont tous été serviables.

‘The tourists asked questions to a guard who was watching over a room of the museum. They were all helpful.’

(54) a. Les huit critiques ont vu un film. Ils ont tous duré plus de deux heures.

‘The eight critics watched a movie. They all lasted more than two hours.’

b. Les huit touristes ont interrogé un garde qui surveillait une salle de musée. Ils ont tous été serviables.

‘The eight tourists asked questions to a guard who was watching over a room of the museum. They were all helpful.’

(55) a. Marie et Claire ont vu un film. Ils ont tous les deux duré plus de deux heures.

‘Marie and Claire watched a movie. They both lasted more than two hours.’

b. Marie et Claire ont interrogé un garde qui surveillait une salle de musée. Ils ont tous les deux été serviables.

‘Marie and Claire asked questions to a guard who was watching over a room of the museum. They were both helpful.’

Given that a plural continuation requires the preceding indefinite *un film* (‘a movie’) or *un garde* (‘a guard’) to be interpreted in the scope of a distributive operator, this shows that plural definites do not provide distributive operators in the same way as quantifiers, coordinations or plurals with numerals.

Note nevertheless that (51)a’ does not imply that the critics watched the same movie. Also, a plural definite can combine with a distributive predicate as in (56).

(51)a’. Les critiques ont vu un film. ‘The critics watched a movie.’

(56) Les critiques ont les yeux bleus. ‘The critics have blue eyes.’

This suggests that the possibility of being the subject of a distributive predicate as in (51)a' and (56) does not entail the possibility of being a distributive operator taking scope over an indefinite as shown by (51).¹¹

The reciprocal interpretation is thus harder to obtain in (49) because the licensor – plural definite – does not easily license a distributive operator that can outscope an indefinite. In fact, this interpretation is impossible with collective licensors like *la classe* ('the class'):

- (57) a. #*La classe a vu un film différent.*
'The class watched a different movie.'
b. #*La classe a vu un film.*
'The class watched a movie.'

(57)a cannot mean that each student of the class watched a different movie (than the others), because (57)b cannot be interpreted this way either: only one movie is involved as *la classe* 'the class' is collective and does not license a distributive operator.

Also, this distributivity issue makes the reciprocal interpretation unavailable with plural definites for a second reason: the underspecified pronoun that occurs in the comparative clause under the present analysis could hardly be interpreted as a reciprocal just like the plural pronoun in (58) when anteceded by a plural definite.

- (58) a. ??*Les étudiants ont dit qu'ils étaient malades.*
'The students said that they were sick.'

Intended interpretation: each student said that the others were sick.

- b. ??*Ces amis d'enfance espèrent qu'ils iront à leur enterrement.*
'These childhood friends hope that they will come to their funeral.'

Intended interpretation: each friend hopes that the others will come to his funeral.

In sum, singular *différent* can give rise to reciprocal interpretations only if the licensor provides a distributive operator: this is the case of quantifiers, coordinations, partitioned plurals, as opposed to plain plural definites and collectives. Thus the difference between singular and plural *différent* in (49) and (10)' in licensing the internal reciprocal interpretation comes down to the difference between plural definites and other licensors with respect to distributivity.

- (49) ?_{reciprocal} *Les critiques ont vu un film différent.*
'The critics watched a different movie.'

¹¹ This is by itself an interesting issue that I cannot treat here. See Schwarzschild (1993) for the hypothesis that distributive interpretations of sentences with plural definite subjects do not derive from the presence of a silent distributive operator but differ from non-distributive interpretations only pragmatically. Also note that the absence of distributive operators with plural definites in the plain meaning is also implied by analyses that suppose a homogeneity presupposition for plural definites (a.o. Loebner: 1987) or obtain the universal reading of plural definites in upward entailing environments through an implicature (Magri: 2014).

- (10)' OK_{reciprocal} Les critiques ont vu des films différents.
'The critics watched different movies.'

Unlike singular *différent*, plural *différent* can indeed be analyzed in terms of cover à la Beck (2000) as explained in section 2.1.2. This is why (49), which can only be constructed with a silent CP and is subject to the distributivity issue discussed above, contrasts with (10)', which can be analyzed as involving a DP complement: (10)' can mean that each critic watched a different movie than the other critics because the movies are denoted by a plural DP and can pragmatically be partitioned along the dimension of viewers.

- (49) ? Les critiques ont vu un film différent ~~de~~ [CP ~~wh-film~~ X_{reciprocal} ~~ont vu wh-film~~].
'The critics watched a different movie ~~than~~ [CP ~~wh-movie~~ X_{reciprocal} ~~watched wh-movie~~].'

- (10)' Les critiques ont vu des films *[Cov différents [DP ~~de~~ X_{reciprocal}]]].
'The critics watched *[Cov different movies [DP ~~from~~ X_{reciprocal}]]].'

Note that in English, the data are reported to be different (the following examples come from Brasoveanu, 2011: 4): not only does a simple plural as in (59)a preclude a reciprocal interpretation (i.e. the equivalent contrast between (49) and (10)' is stronger), but also numerals as in (59)b, *all* as in (59)c and conjuncts as in (59)d.

- (59) a. The boys recited a different poem. (sentence-external only)
b. Two / The two boys recited a different poem. (sentence-external only)
c. All (of) the boys recited a different poem. (sentence-external only)
d. Linus and Mary recited a different poem. (sentence-external only)

This led some researchers (e.g. Brasoveanu 2011) to posit two different lexical entries for singular *different* and plural *different*. This difference between French and English would require further investigation to understand to which extent the present analysis could be applied to English.¹² Note nevertheless that an anonymous reviewer found the reciprocal interpretation to be readily available in (59)c, though not in the other examples in (59), which suggests that there appears to be some speaker variation here. I suspect that such variation could be due to differences - between French and English and/or among speakers - with respect to the licensing of silent distributive operators.¹³

¹² As noted by Brasoveanu (2011), Dotlačil (2010: 219–222) observes that sentence-internal readings under plural definites or DP conjunctions are available for one of the counterparts of singular *different* in Dutch and Czech. See Dotlačil (2010) for more detail about the relation between distributivity and licensing of *same*, *different* and *other* in Dutch.

¹³ For instance, the fact that *all the boys*, *the two boys* and *Linus and Mary* pattern with *the boys*, not with *every boy* (according to Brasoveanu 2011) as far as the licensing of the internal reciprocal interpretation of *different* is concerned, may be related to the fact that English has two distributive quantifiers *each* (strongly

Binding of the underspecified pronoun by a quantified licenser?

A further question that arises concerning licensors is whether a quantified licenser (e.g. *chaque critique* 'each critic' below) binds the silent underspecified pronoun (X) under the reflexive interpretation.

- (12)' Chaque critique a vu un film différent de [_{CP} ~~wh-film~~ X a vu ~~wh-film~~].
'Each critic watched a different movie than [_{CP} ~~wh-movie~~ X watched ~~wh-movie~~].'

Indeed, the reflexive interpretation seems to be paraphrasable by a bound pronoun:

- (60) Cette semaine, [chaque critique]_k a vu un film différent de celui qu'il_k a vu la semaine dernière.
'This week, [each critic]_k watched a different movie than he_k saw last week.'

This question is hard to answer for the following reasons.

First, a positive answer would predict that the licenser must c-command the elided comparative clause at LF. But this is tricky to test as we have seen that a quantificational licenser must anyway outscope the DP containing *différent* for a distributive interpretation to arise, which is required under the reciprocal and reflexive interpretations: if the licenser cannot move, the internal interpretation is anyway unavailable. Therefore, we cannot prove that binding is mandatory by using cases where the licenser does not c-command the *sidi* term (or cannot move to c-command it), which would preclude binding, because the movement of the licenser is anyway required for another reason.

Furthermore, we can obtain the right interpretation when there is no possible binding, i.e. a plural pronoun that is not bound by a quantifier like *each* can be interpreted reflexively or reciprocally. Consider the following sentences :

- (61) Le film que chaque critique a vu leur a plu.
'The movie that each critic watched pleased them.'

- (62) (*Speaking of a group of friends*) La certitude que chacun mourra un jour les attriste.
'The certainty that each one will die some day makes them sad.'

(61) is an example of sentence where a plural pronoun (*leur* 'them') licenses a reflexive distributive interpretation even if it is not bound by *each* (*each critic* does not c-command *them* and cannot QR since it occurs in an island): for each critic, the movie he saw pleases him. Sentence (62) illustrates that *les* 'them' also licenses a reciprocal

distributive) and *every* (weakly distributive), while French only has one (*chaque* 'each'). The existence of weakly distributive *every* may preclude – by competition – *all the boys*, *the two boys* and *Linus and Mary* from licensing a silent distributive operator.

distributive interpretation if it is not bound by *each* (*chacun* ‘each one’ does not c-command *les* ‘them’ and occurs in an island): it means that for each friend, his future death makes his friends sad; this is possible in a context where one’s own death does not make one sad.

Can Weak Crossover (WCO) help us decide? If the silent underspecified element present in the comparative clause is bound by the quantified licenser, this seems to predict WCO effects when the licenser needs to cross over the *sidi* term to c-command it. In other words, WCO seems to be an argument that there cannot be binding in such cases but the right interpretation obtains without binding as in (61). Note that according to Brasoveanu (2011: 137-138), WCO is a reason to analyse singular *different* and pronominal items in a different way.¹⁴

To be more precise, consider again the relevant example:

- (46) Un critique différent a vu chaque film.
 ‘A different critic watched each movie.’

If the binding of the underspecified element X is mandatory, the licenser must QR to be able to bind this element, which occurs in a reduced comparative clause as illustrated below.

- (63) [Chaque film]₁ Un critique différent ~~de~~ [_{CP} ~~wh-critique~~ ~~wh-critique~~ ~~a vu~~ X₁] a vu
 [~~chaque film~~]₁.
 ‘[Each movie]₁ A different critic ~~than~~ [_{CP} ~~wh-critic~~ ~~wh-critic~~ ~~watched~~ X₁] watched
 [~~each movie~~]₁.’

This configuration seems to correspond to a WCO configuration: to bind X, the quantifier *chaque film* ‘each movie’ crosses over it by covert movement (QR), just as in standard cases of WCO such as ‘?his_i mother loves [each boy]_i’. Yet, the sentence is grammatical, which would suggest that there is no binding.

Nevertheless, two observations are in order here.

First, the silent element is embedded into a (reduced) comparative clause, and WCO effects tend to be obviated when the bound pronoun is deeply embedded in a clause (as noted in Fox 2000: footnote 23, and Sportiche: 2005). This is illustrated in (64) showing that WCO effects are drastically reduced if the pronoun is embedded in a clause inside the subject: (64)b where the pronoun *le* is embedded in a relative clause sounds much better than (64)a that contains a possessive pronoun.

¹⁴ Brasoveanu (2011) predicts the presence of WCO effects with pronouns because their anaphoric potential is analyzed in terms of dref (i.e. discourse referent in dynamic semantics) coindexation. However, he predicts the absence of WCO effects with sentence-internal singular *different* because no dref coindexation is established between *different* and the distributive quantifier licensing it: singular *different* is always coindexed with the immediately preceding indefinite article, so the WCO constraint does not apply.

- (64) a. ?? Son₁ propriétaire a rangé [chaque jouet]₁.
 'Its₁ owner put [each toy]₁ away.'
 b. (?) L'enfant qui l'₁ a utilisé a rangé [chaque jouet]₁.
 'The child who used it₁ put [each toy]₁ away.'

Like (64)b, a version of (63) containing an overt relative comparative clause is acceptable.

- (65) Cette semaine, un critique différent de celui qui l'₁ a vu la semaine dernière a vu [chaque film]₁.
 'This week, a critic different from the one that watched it₁ last week watched [each movie]₁.'

Second, the element to be bound is silent and WCO is supposed to hold for explicit pronouns and may not hold for silent elements. Thus, (66) demonstrates that WCO effects do not appear to obtain with silent elements selected by relational nouns.

- (66) a. Un voisin procédurier a attaqué en justice chacun de mes amis.
 'A litigious neighbor sued each of my friends.'
 b. ?? Son₁ voisin procédurier a attaqué en justice [chacun de mes amis]₁.
 'His₁ litigious neighbor sued [each of my friends]₁.'
 c. Un rival de longue date a trahi chacun de ces gouverneurs.
 'A longstanding rival betrayed each of these governors.'
 d. ?? Son₁ rival de longue date a trahi [chacun de ces gouverneurs]₁.
 'His₁ longstanding rival betrayed [each of these governors]₁.'

Voisin ('neighbor') in (66)a and *rival* ('rival') in (66)c contain an implicit argument that can respectively be bound by *chacun de mes amis* ('each of my friends') and *chacun de ces gouverneurs* ('each of these governors'). This should yield a WCO effect just as in (66)b and (66)d involving overt bound pronouns; yet the sentences are acceptable under the bound reading, which suggests that WCO effects are at the very least reduced with silent elements.

Thus WCO is to be qualified: the effect depends on the embedding and the overtiness of the pronoun. Therefore, it does not constitute an argument against binding of the silent pronoun by the licenser.

In sum, it seems that binding of the silent pronoun by a quantified licenser is possible, but there is no way to decide whether it is obligatory because configurations which would rule out the sentence under the binding hypothesis (the licenser cannot c-command the silent pronoun) are anyway precluded for other reasons, because the pertinent interpretation can obtain without binding, and because Weak Crossover is not relevant in our cases.

To summarize the section, here are the main cases of standards as CP.

Case	Example
Standard as partially elided comparative clause ('than [_{CP} remnant]')	(4)' Paul a vu un film différent de [_{CP} wh-film Marie a vu wh-film]. 'Paul watched a different movie than [_{CP} wh-movie Marie watched wh-movie]. (5)' J'ai regardé un film différent de [_{CP} wh-film j'ai regardé wh-film hier]. 'I watched a different movie than [_{CP} wh-movie I watched wh-movie yesterday].'
Standard as fully elided comparative clause ('than [_{CP} X]') X is underspecified and can in particular be interpreted as a pronoun, a reflexive or a reciprocal.	(12)' Chaque critique a vu un film différent de [_{CP} wh-film X ont vu wh-film]. 'Each critic watched a different movie than [_{CP} wh-movie X watched wh-movie].' (13)' Paul et Claire ont vu un film différent de [_{CP} wh-film X ont vu wh-film]. 'Paul and Claire watched a different movie than [_{CP} wh-movie X watched wh-movie].'

Table 2: Standard as CP

2.2.3 An argument for the presence of CP: island effects

Recall that at the end of section 2.1, we saw that the pragmatic account proposed by Beck (2000) for cases like (10)' or (32) (case noted 'from $X_{\text{reciprocal}}$ ') correctly predicts that two plural DPs containing *différents* can be separated by a scope island as in (34) repeated below.

- (34) a. Les films que Paul et Claire ont vus sont différents.
'The movies that Frank and Bärbel watched are different.'
b. Paul et Claire ont vu des films qui menaient à des conclusions différentes.
'Paul and Claire watched movies that came to different conclusions.'

Conversely, we will see in this section that cases like (12)' (case noted 'than [_{CP} X]') or (4)' (cases noted 'than [_{CP} remnant]') are sensitive to islands,¹⁵ which supports the hypothesis that *différent* is complemented by a silent comparative clause in such cases.

Licensor in island

First, internal interpretations are unavailable when the licensor (but not *différent*) is in an island. This follows under the present analysis that supposes the presence of an elided

¹⁵ Moltmann (1992) already mentions some island facts in English to argue for the following claim: *same/different* with a quantified antecedent enters a syntactic relation that is different from the syntactic relation involving anaphors, bound variables and *wh*-movement, but that is parallel to the syntactic relation between *each other* and its reciprocal antecedent.

comparative clause in such cases because the licenser fails to move out of the island: this is a problem when there is a remnant in the comparative clause because the identity condition on ellipsis cannot be satisfied. This is illustrated in (67) (the remnant *Paul* in (a)-(d) or *cette faute-là* 'that mistake' in (e) is here extraposed, but the same holds if it is not).¹⁶ The sentences involve adjunct islands ((67)a, (69)a), coordination islands ((67)b, (69)b), clausal complements of non-bridge verbs ((67)c, (69)c), wh-islands ((67)d, (69)d) and subject islands ((67)e, (69)e).

- (67) a. *Une personne différente est en colère parce qu'Anne a vaincu Luc de Paul.
'A different person is angry because Anne beat Luc than Paul.'

Intended interpretation: the person that is angry because Anne beat Luc is different from the person that is angry because Anne beat Paul.

- b. * Une personne différente a critiqué Pierre et Luc de Paul.
'A different person criticized Pierre and Luc than Paul.'

Intended interpretation: the person that criticized Pierre and Luc is different from the person that criticized Pierre and Paul.

- c. * Une personne différente chuchote qu'Anne a vaincu Luc de Paul.
'A different person whispers that Anne beat Luc than Paul.'

Intended interpretation: the person that whispers that Anne beat Luc is different from the person that whispers that Anne beat Paul.

- d. * Une personne différente se demande quand Anne vaincra Luc de Paul.
'A different person wonders when Anne will beat Luc than Paul.'

Intended interpretation: the person that wonders when Anne will beat Luc is different from the person that wonders when Anne will beat Paul.

- e. * Que Luc ait fait cette faute-ci déçoit un joueur différent de cette faute-là.
'That Luc made this mistake disappoints a different player than that mistake.'

Intended interpretation: the player that is disappointed because Luc made this mistake is different from the player that is disappointed because Luc made that mistake.

None of the intended interpretations in (67) is available: the only possible interpretation in (a)-(d) – if *de Paul* was not extraposed – would be that the person in question is different from Paul ((e) could not be interpreted at all since a player cannot be compared to a mistake).

¹⁶ I extrapose it to give more chance to the example. Indeed, extraposed comparative clauses with regular comparatives improve examples where the compared element is not in subject position; this is the case of (x)a repeated below where *this equation* occurs in object position.

(xi) a. * A smarter student than this equation solved this problem.

b. ? A smarter student solved this problem than this equation.

Intended meaning: a smarter student than the student that solved this equation solved this problem.

Note that this argues in favor of Fox's (2002) analysis of ACD that assumes late insertion of the relative clause. Fox's analysis could be here adopted for the comparative clause of *sidi* terms and regular comparatives; the present analysis does not hinge on a specific analysis of ACD resolution.

The unavailability of the internal reciprocal interpretation in all these sentences involving islands is predicted by the proposed analysis because it supposes the presence of an elided comparative clause. Indeed, the same holds with regular comparatives:

- (68) *Une personne plus importante est en colère parce qu'Anne a battu Pierre que Marie.

'A more important person is angry because Anne beat Pierre than Marie.'

(68) cannot mean that the person that is angry because Anne beat Pierre is more important than the person that is angry because Anne beat Marie. This is so because *Pierre* (assumed to be focused under Heim's (1997) analysis) cannot move out of the *because* clause due to island constraints (adjunct island here) and thus the right antecedent for the ellipsis in the comparative clause cannot be constructed as explained for (40)' in section 2.2.1.

Similarly, internal interpretations are unavailable when the comparative clause is completely silent as exemplified in (69), namely when the licenser appearing in an island is a quantifier.

- (69) a. # Une personne différente est en colère parce qu'Anne a vaincu chaque joueur.

'A different person is angry because Anne beat every player.'

Intended interpretation: for each player that Anne beat, there is a different person who is angry.

- b. # Une personne différente a critiqué Luc et chaque joueur.

'A different person criticized Luc and every player.'

Intended interpretation: Luc is criticized by everybody and each player is criticized by a different person.

- c. # Une personne différente chuchote qu'Anne a vaincu chaque joueur.

'A different person whispers that Anne beat every player.'

Intended interpretation: for each player that was beaten by Anne, there is a different person that whispers that it happened.

- d. # Une personne différente se demande quand Anne vaincra chaque joueur.

'A different person wonders when Anne will beat every player.'

Intended interpretation: for each player, there is a different person that wonders when Anne will beat him.

- e. # Que Luc ait fait chaque faute déçoit un joueur différent.

'That Luc made every mistake disappoints a different player.'

Intended interpretation: for each mistake made by Luc there is a different player that is disappointed.

Internal readings cannot obtain in (69) because *chaque joueur* 'every player' in (a)-(d) or *chaque faute* 'every mistake' in (e) would need to move out of the clause for QR

reasons: the indefinite DP containing *différent* needs to be outscoped by the quantifier licenser (as explained in section 2.2.2. e.g. for (46) and (47)); but such a movement crosses an island in all these examples. (69) could only mean that the person (in a-d) or the player (in e) is different from a person mentioned in the context (external interpretation).

The previous examples contrast with sentences that contain several clauses but do not involve islands: (70) is better than (69).

- (70) % Une personne différente pense qu'Anne vaincra chaque joueur.
'A different person thinks that Anne will beat every player.'

This sentence is more acceptable than (69) because there is no island precluding QR of the licenser *chaque joueur* ('every player'), which is necessary to create the right antecedent for the ellipsis.

Note that this sentence is however degraded for some French speakers. This could be explained by the fact that QR is sometimes assumed to be clause bounded as opposed to *wh*-movement (cf. a.o. Farkas 1981). Nevertheless, Fox (2000) shows that QR is not clause bounded in the case of ACD. Also, some quantifiers can scope outside their tensed clause ("scope out" phenomenon), as illustrated below where both the wide-scope and the narrow-scope readings of *every* are available:

- (71) One girl knows what every boy bought for Mary.

In any case, the crucial point here is that (70) is better than (69) and this follows from the proposed analysis.

Différent in island

Conversely, internal interpretations cannot obtain when *différent* occurs in an island, which also supports the hypothesis that the silent complement of *différent* is a clause. Under this analysis, the unavailability of these interpretations comes from the fact that the island constraint is violated both by the *wh*-movement required in the elided comparative clause and by the movement of the DP containing *différent* that is necessary to resolve ACD. The following sentences illustrate these facts.

- (72) a. # Luc est en colère parce qu'Anne a vaincu une personne différente de Paul.
'Luc is angry because Anne beat a different person than Paul.'

Intended interpretation: the person such that Luc is angry because Anne beat her is different from the person such that Paul is angry because Anne beat her.

- b. # Luc a critiqué Pierre et une personne différente de Paul.
'Luc criticized Pierre and a different person than Paul.'

Intended interpretation: the person such that Luc criticized Pierre and her is different from the person such that Paul criticized Pierre and her.

c. # Luc chuchote qu'Anne a vaincu une personne différente de Paul.

'Luc whispers that Anne beat a different person than Paul.'

Intended interpretation: the person such that Luc whispers that Anne beat her is different from the person such that Paul whispers that Anne beat her.

d. # Luc se demande quand Anne vaincra une personne différente de Paul.

'Luc wonders when Anne will beat a different person than Paul.'

Intended interpretation: the person such that Luc wonders when Anne will beat her is different from the person such that Paul wonders when Anne will beat her.

e. # Que Pierre ait fait une faute différente déçoit Luc de Paul.

'That Pierre made a different mistake disappoints Luc than Paul.'

Intended interpretation: the mistake such that it disappoints Luc that Pierre made it is different from the mistake such that it disappoints Paul that Pierre made it.

(73) a. # Chaque joueur est en colère parce qu'Anne a vaincu une personne différente.

'Every player is angry because Anne beat a different person.'

Intended interpretation: for each player x, there is a person y such that x is angry because Anne beat y.

b. # Chaque joueur a critiqué Luc et une personne différente.

'Every player criticized Luc and a different person.'

Intended interpretation: for each player x, there is a person y such that x criticized Luc and y.

c. # Chaque joueur chuchote qu'Anne a vaincu une personne différente.

'Every player whispers that Anne beat a different person.'

Intended interpretation: for each player x, there is a person y such that x whispers that Anne beat y.

d. # Chaque joueur se demande quand Anne vaincra une personne différente.

'Every player wonders when Anne will beat a different person.'

Intended interpretation: for each player x, there is a person y such that x will be offended if you criticize y.

e. # Que Luc ait fait une faute différente déçoit chaque joueur.

'That Luc made a different mistake disappoints every player.'

Intended interpretation: for each player x, there is a mistake y such that the fact that Luc made y disappoints y.

As in the previous case, the same holds with regular comparatives (as observed e.g. by Kennedy: 2002).

(74) # Pierre est en colère parce qu'Anne a battu un meilleur joueur que Marie.

'Pierre is angry because Anne beat a better player than Marie.'

(74) cannot mean that the player that Pierre is angry because Anne beat her/him is better than the player that Marie is angry because Anne beat her/him.

This is due to the fact that this interpretation would require two island violations: one by the movement required for the resolution of ACD (as explained in the previous section, the *sidi/comparative* term must be moved out of the clause to avoid infinite regression when copying the antecedent in the ellipsis site); the other one by the *wh*-movement of the degree/*sidi* term in the elided comparative clause.

However as before, similar sentences (with two clauses) that do not involve islands are crucially acceptable:

- (75) Chaque joueur pense qu'Anne vaincra une personne différente.
'Each player thinks that Anne will beat a different player.'

This is so because here, the movement of *différent* out of the overt clause and the *wh*-movement of *différent* in the elided comparative clause do not cross an island and are thus possible.

In sum, the island sensitivity shown by internal interpretations supports the proposed analysis based on the presence of an elided comparative clause as complement of *différent* because these island effects can be accounted for by mechanisms required in the presence of comparative clauses.

2.2.4 Comparison with comparatives and relational terms

Comparatives

The present analysis makes *différent* parallel to a regular comparative in that they are both complemented by comparative clauses. In fact, we have observed that the constructions involving a remnant in the comparative clause are similar:

- (4)' Paul a vu un film différent de Marie.
'Paul watched a different movie than Marie.'

- (37) Paul a vu un film plus intéressant que Marie.
'Paul watched a more interesting movie than Marie.'

Concerning constructions with fully elided comparative clauses, they are acceptable under the pronominal and reflexive interpretations, but not under the reciprocal interpretation. This is so for both comparatives of inferiority/superiority (cf. (76)) and equatives (cf. (77)).

- (76) a. *Lucie et Claire ont mis une robe plus/moins élégante.
 'Lucie and Claire put on a more/less elegant dress.'
 b. *Chaque fille a mis une robe plus/moins élégante.
 'Each girl put on a more/less elegant dress.'

- (77) a. ?Lucie et Claire ont mis une robe aussi élégante.
 'Lucie and Claire put on an as elegant dress.'
 b. ?Chaque fille a mis une robe aussi élégante.
 'Each girl put on an as elegant dress.'

Indeed, (76) can only mean that Lucie and Claire or each girl put on a more/less elegant dress than they did themselves at another occasion (reflexive interpretation) or than someone else did (pronominal interpretation): it cannot mean that the dress that each girl put on is more/less elegant than the dress that each other girl put on (this would lead to a contradiction). The corresponding interpretations are more accessible in (77), but the sentences are degraded too.

As in the previous case (cf. section 2.1.2, examples (30) and (31)), I suppose that this is due to the meaning of comparatives: since comparatives are not inherently symmetrical, the underspecified element X present in the elided comparative clause cannot be interpreted as a reciprocal.

This hypothesis is supported by the fact that a pseudo-reciprocal interpretation becomes available with comparatives when the ordering constraint is controlled, e.g. by the presence of *chaque* ('each'), which can imply succession.¹⁷

- (78) a. Je l'aime un peu plus/moins chaque jour.
 'I like her a little more/less every day.'

Intended interpretation: for each day x, y such that y > x (i.e. y temporally following x), I like her a little more/less on day y than on day x.

- b. Ce joueur devient meilleur/plus mauvais à chaque match.
 'This player gets better/worse at every game.'

Intended interpretation: for each game x, y such that y > x (i.e. y temporally following x), this player gets better/worse at game y than at game x.

Relational terms

Relational terms different from *different*, *same* or *other* do not however license elided comparative clauses with a remnant as illustrated in (79) with *similaire* 'similar' and in (80) with *ennemi* 'enemy, hostile'.

¹⁷ The reason why *chaque* ('each') can express succession is not my concern here.

(79) a. ??J'ai mis une robe similaire à hier.

'I put on a similar dress to yesterday.'

Intended interpretation: I put on a dress similar to the dress that I put on yesterday.

b. ??Claire a mis une robe similaire à Lucie.

'Claire put on a similar dress to Lucie.'

Intended interpretation: Claire put on a dress similar to the dress that Lucie put on.

(80) a. *J'ai rencontré un homme ennemi d'hier.

'I met a man hostile to yesterday.'

Intended interpretation: I met a man hostile to the man that I met yesterday.

b. #Claire a rencontré un homme ennemi de Lucie.

'Claire met a man hostile to Lucie.'

Intended interpretation: Claire met a man hostile to the man that Lucie met.

I therefore hypothesize that there is a selectional difference between *différent* and relational adjectives like *similaire* or *ennemi*: semantically, all combine with two individuals, but syntactically, the former can select a CP (free relative denoting an individual), but the latter cannot; note that this correlates with the fact that the latter do not use a linker typical of comparatives. I suppose that this difference comes from the fact that *différent* can move and thus resolve ACD as explained in section 2.2.1..

The unavailability of internal readings with fully elided comparative clauses in the cases of *similaire* or *ennemi* follows:¹⁸

(81) a. ? Lucie et Claire ont mis une robe similaire.

'Lucie and Claire put on a similar dress.'

Intended interpretation: The dress that Lucie put on is similar to the dress that Claire put on.

b. ? Chaque fille a mis une robe similaire.

'Each girl put on a similar dress.'

Intended interpretation: the dress that each girl put on is similar to the dress that the other girls put on.

(82) a. # Lucie et Claire ont rencontré un homme ennemi.

'Lucie and Claire met an hostile man.'

Intended interpretation: the man that Lucie met is hostile to the man that Claire met.

¹⁸ Note that the sentences with *similaire* (under the intended interpretation) are better than those involving *ennemi*. This can be related to the fact that the meaning of *similaire* is close to the meaning of *sidi* terms (*same/different/other*): in fact, the same happens with other relational adjectives that denote similar notions like *semblable* ('similar', 'like'), *identique* ('identical'), *pareil* ('the same', 'such'), *distinct* ('distinct'), *dissemblable* ('dissimilar')...etc. Thus it seems that other adjectives denoting notions of similarity or difference can be coerced into behaving like *sidi* terms, i.e. licensing a CP complement. The necessity of coercion yields intermediate judgments.

- b. # Chaque fille a rencontré un homme ennemi.
'Each girl met an hostile man.'

Intended interpretation: the man that each girl met is hostile to the man that the other girls met.

To sum up, I propose that *différent* can be analyzed in a uniform way without postulating any specific mechanism if we assume that it is a relational adjective that can select a comparative clause: like a relational term, it combines with two individuals and denotes a relation between them; like a comparative, it can select a comparative clause. The difference with the former is that relational terms different from *sidi* terms cannot combine with comparative clauses; the difference with the latter is that other comparatives deal with degrees, not individuals.

Based on this hypothesis, the variety of constructions comes from the diverse possibilities of constructing the standard: this individual can project as a DP or a CP; such DPs and CPs can be more or less elided and the silent elements can receive various interpretations.

3 *Même* and *autre*

We will see in this section that this analysis can extend to the other *sidi* terms *même* ('same') and *autre* ('other'). I will show how the few differences between *différent* and *même* or *autre* are due to independent factors.

3.1 *Même* ('same')

3.1.1 Data

First, disregarding a difference in determiner that is orthogonal to my main issue here (see appendix B for more about this issue), *même* exhibits a distribution that is very similar to that of *différent*.

Case	Example
Standard as overt DP (‘from DP’)	(1)'' Lucie est la même que Claire. 'Lucie is the same as Claire.' (2)'' J'ai vu le même film que ce film-là. 'I watched the same movie as this one.' (3)'' Paul a vu le même film que ce que proposait Marie. 'Paul watched the same movie as what Marie proposed.'

<p>Standard as implicit DP (‘from X’) X is underspecified and can in particular be interpreted as a pronoun, a reflexive or a reciprocal.</p>	<p>(6)” Lucie est allée voir <i>Frida</i> hier. Moi, j’ai vu le même film que X. ‘Lucie watched <i>Frida</i> yesterday. As for me, I watched the same movie as X.’ (7)” [<i>Watching a trailer</i>] C’est le même film que X que j’avais vu. ‘It is the same movie as X that I had watched.’ (8)” Ces films sont les mêmes que X. ‘These movies are the same as X.’ (9)” ?J’ai vu les mêmes films que X pendant les vacances. ‘I watched the same movies as X during the holidays.’ (10)” Les critiques ont vu les mêmes films que X. ‘The critics watched the same movies as X.’ (11)” Par rapport à la semaine dernière, chaque enfant est le même que X aujourd’hui. ‘As compared to last week, each child is the same as X today.’</p>
<p>Standard as partially elided comparative clause (‘than [CP remnant]’)</p>	<p>(4)” Paul a vu le même film que [CP wh-film Marie a vu wh-film]. ‘Paul watched the same movie as [CP wh-movie Marie watched wh-movie].’ (5)” J’ai regardé le même film que [CP wh-film j’ai regardé wh-film hier]. ‘I watched the same movie as [CP wh-movie I watched yesterday].’</p>
<p>Standard as fully elided comparative clause (‘than [CP X]’) X is underspecified and can in particular be interpreted as a pronoun, a reflexive or a reciprocal.</p>	<p>(12)” Chaque critique a vu le même film que [CP wh-film X ont vu wh-film]. ‘Each critic watched the same movie as [CP wh-movie X watched wh-movie].’ (13)” Paul et Claire ont vu le même film que [CP wh-film X ont vu wh-film]. ‘Paul and Claire watched the same movie as [CP wh-movie X watched wh-movie].’</p>

Table 3: main cases with *même*

Furthermore, the same island facts obtain with *même*. The internal reading is not available when *même* is in an island and the licenser is not, as in the cases with *différent* in (72) and (73). Here, I only illustrate the cases involving an adjunct island:

(83) # Luc est en colère parce qu’Anne a vaincu la même personne que Paul.

‘Luc is angry because Anne beat the same person as Paul.’

Intended interpretation: the person that made Luc angry because Anne beat her is the same as the person that made Paul angry because Anne beat her.

(84) # Aucun joueur n'est en colère parce qu'Anne a vaincu la même personne.

'No player is angry because Anne beat the same person.'

Intended interpretation: for each player x, there is a different person y that made x angry because Anne beat y.

Note that I here use *aucun* ('no') as a distributive quantifier for the licensor in (84) because with *même*, this clearly distinguishes the targeted internal interpretation from the external one: thus in (a), the intended internal interpretation entails that every player is angry because of a different person being beaten by Anne, while under the external interpretation, only one person – the same as a previously mentioned one – would have been defeated (and no player would be angry because of that). It is clear that the sentence cannot express the first situation.

The reverse case – the licensor is an island, unlike *même* – is however harder to illustrate for the reason I just mentioned. We cannot use *aucun* as licensor because for independent reasons that I cannot detail here, *aucun* is not able to take scope over *même*.¹⁹ Moreover, another quantifier (e.g. *chaque* 'every, each' below) makes the internal and the external interpretations hardly distinguishable because only one person is at stake in both cases.

(85) # La même personne est en colère parce qu'Anne a vaincu chaque joueur.

'The same person is angry because Anne beat every player.'

Internal interpretation: for each player, the person that is angry because Anne beat him is the same as the person that is angry because Anne beat the other players (thus there is only one angry person).

External interpretation: for each player, the person that is angry because Anne beat him is the same as some contextually salient person (thus there is only one angry person).

Nevertheless, the absence of a contextually salient person makes this sentence degraded, which suggests that *même* resembles *différent* in this respect too.

3.1.2 Account for the differences with *différent*

The table and examples above demonstrate that *même* and *différent* exhibit almost the same behavior. *Même* only differs from *différent* in two respects.

Standard as silent DP interpreted as reciprocal

First, there is a contrast between the following two sentences:

¹⁹ The following sentence (xii)a cannot have the same meaning as the passive in (xii)b:

(xii) a. Le même joueur n'a remporté aucune partie.

'The same player won no game.'

b. Aucune partie n'a été remportée par le même joueur.

'No game was won by the same player.'

(9)' J'ai vu des films différents ~~que~~ X pendant les vacances.
'I watched different movies ~~than~~ X during the holidays.'

(9)'' ?J'ai vu les mêmes films ~~que~~ X pendant les vacances.
'I watched the same movies ~~as~~ X during the holidays.'

The reciprocal interpretation of X is salient in (9)' (i.e. I watched movies that are different from each other during the holidays), but it is hardly available in (9)'' (i.e. I watched movies that are the same as each other during the holidays).

Here is a possible explanation for this contrast: a complete reciprocal identity (as would be the case under the intended interpretation in (9)'' with *même*) usually amounts to a single object. (86) could thus be pragmatically unfelicitous under the reciprocal interpretation because it can be expressed by a singular as in (87).

(86) ? J'ai mis les mêmes robes la semaine dernière.
'I put on the same dresses last week.'

(87) J'ai mis la même robe la semaine dernière.
'I put on the same dress last week.'

However, we observe that it is possible to use *identique* ('identical') in these cases.

(88) J'ai mis des robes identiques la semaine dernière.
'I put on identical dresses last week.'

(88) means that last week, I put on several dresses that looked identical. But the plural is here licensed because there are several dresses in question, and they can be said to be identical because they are of the same kind. In other words, (88) is interpretable under a type reading, which involves several objects, not under a token reading involving a single dress. Thus the type/token ambiguity that is orthogonal to the main issue of this paper (see a.o. Alrenga 2007 for more detail) may well play a role in the difference between (9)'' and (9)'. My hypothesis is that *même* preferably gives rise to token readings contrary to *identique*; that's why (9)'' is degraded (the token reading of *même* favors the use of a singular as in (87)) contrary to (88) (the type reading of *identique* licenses the plural).

Strikingly, this interpretation with *même* improves when the type reading is made explicit:

(89) J'ai mis les mêmes genres de robes la semaine dernière.
'I put on the same kinds of dresses last week.'

Moreover, (86) can be licensed under this interpretation if the context is enriched to make the type reading salient as illustrated in (90):

(90) Il y a deux semaines, il a fait si chaud que seules les robes extrêmement légères que j'avais achetées en Afrique étaient mettables. Du coup, cette semaine-là, je n'ai pas fait d'effet de style, j'ai mis les mêmes robes.

'Two weeks ago, it was so hot that only the extremely thin dresses that I had bought in Africa were bearable. So during that week, I didn't look for stylistic change, I put on the same dresses.'

This supports the hypothesis that this difference between *même* and *différent* comes from an independent fact: unlike *différent* or *identique*, *même* preferably gives rise to token readings.

(91) $\llbracket même \rrbracket = \lambda x. \lambda y. \forall P \in C, P(x) = P(y)$ (C is a set of contextually relevant properties, preferably including all possible properties)

Plural as licensor under a reciprocal interpretation

Conversely, *même* is more permissive than *différent* in the case where the licensor is a simple plural and the *sidi* term occurs in a singular DP: it more easily licenses the reciprocal interpretation.

(49) ?Les critiques ont vu un film différent.

'The critics watched a different movie.'

Intended interpretation: each critic watched a different movie than the others.

(92) Les critiques ont vu le même film.

'The critics watched the same movie.'

Intended interpretation: each critic watched the same movie as the others.

Recall that we hypothesized that the internal interpretation is hard to obtain in (49) because the indefinite *un film différent* ('a different movie') has to be distributively constructed and this is only possible if it is clear in the context that the critics are constituted of different parts (cf. section 2.2.2.).

The difference between (92) and (49) is due to the fact that the reciprocal interpretation in (92) is entailed by the external interpretation (cf. (85) in section 3.1.1.) so that the distributive construal is not necessary: in every situation where the critics watched the same movie as a certain movie (external interpretation), they watched the same movie as each other: only one movie is at play; in (49) however, the internal interpretation involves several movies while the external one involves only one so that the external interpretation does not entail the internal one.

In fact, (92) is degraded if we add the negation and the context does not make the partition of the licensor explicit:

(93) ?Les critiques n'ont pas vu le même film.

'The critics did not watch the same movie.'

Intended interpretation: each critic watched a different movie than the others.

In (93), the external interpretation does not entail the internal one: for instance, the sentence is true under the first one if all critics watched a certain movie (say, *Stalker*), which is not the same as a contextual movie (say, *Frida*); but this is incompatible with the internal reciprocal interpretation requiring that at least two critics watched different movies. Remarkably, the internal interpretation is not easily accessible here just as in (49).

As noticed by an anonymous reviewer, (49) however does not conversely get as natural as (92) in the presence of the negation:

(94) a. ?Les critiques n'ont pas vu un film différent.

'The critics did not watch a different movie.'

b. ?Les critiques n'ont pas vu de film différent.

'The critics did not watch any different movie.'

But this case is more complex than (93). First, note that the use of the indefinite article (*un film différent* 'a different movie') as in (94)a in this case is not natural. This is due to an independent fact in French: the indefinite article under the negation forces the wide scope of the DP (cf. (95)a); for the narrow scope to obtain under the negation, *un* must be replaced by *de* as in (94)b and (95)b.

(95) a. Les critiques n'ont pas vu un film.

'The critics did not watch a movie.' i.e. there is a certain movie that the critics did not watch.

b. Les critiques n'ont pas vu de film.

'The critics did not watch any movie.' i.e. the critics watched no movie.

But (94)a is therefore very weak since it is sufficient that there exists a movie (which will necessarily be different from a certain movie) that the critics did not watch. That's probably why this sentence is not very felicitous.

As for (94)b that licenses the narrow scope of the indefinite, it differs from (92) in the sense that the external and the internal interpretations can be distinguished in the case where the negation has wide scope: for instance, (94)b is true under the external interpretation if one critic did not watch a movie different from, say, *Frida*, i.e. one critic watched *Frida*, and all the other critics watched different movies; however (94)b is false under the internal interpretation since they watched different movies than each other.

To summarize, I account for the contrast between (49) and (92) in the following way: for the internal reciprocal interpretation to obtain in (49), the licenser 'the critics' needs to be explicitly partitioned as explained in section 2.2.2; this condition is not required in (92)

because the two interpretations are indistinguishable (in particular, the external interpretation entails the internal one). Therefore, it is not necessary to conclude from this contrast that *même* and *différent* intrinsically behave differently as has been argued for English.

In sum, the analysis adopted for *différent* applies to *même*. The few differences in data come from independent facts and do not challenge this analysis.

3.2 *Autre* ('other')

3.2.1 Data

Autre ('other') mostly behaves like *différent* and *même*. The main difference is that the underspecified element cannot be interpreted as a reciprocal. Also, the postnominal and predicative uses of *autre* are more formal and constrained, but here I will not concentrate on these differences that I take to be orthogonal to my main issue.

Case	Example
Standard as overt DP (‘from DP’)	(1)''' ? Lucie est autre que Claire. ²⁰ 'Lucie is other than Claire.' (2)''' J'ai vu un autre film que ce film-là. 'I watched another movie than this one.' (3)''' Paul a vu un autre film que ce que proposait Marie. 'Paul watched another movie than what Marie proposed.'
Standard as implicit DP (‘from X’) X is underspecified and can in particular be interpreted as a pronoun or a reflexive (but not as a reciprocal).	(6)''' Lucie est allée voir <i>Frida</i> hier. Moi, j'ai vu un autre film que X. 'Lucie watched <i>Frida</i> yesterday. As for me, I watched another movie than X.' (7)''' [<i>Watching a trailer</i>] C'est un autre film que X que j'avais vu. 'It is another movie than X that I had watched.' (8)''' ? Ces films sont autres que X. 'These movies are other than X.' (9)''' J'ai vu d'autres films que X pendant les vacances. 'I watched other movies than X during the holidays.' (10)''' Les critiques ont vu d'autres films que X. 'The critics watched other movies than X.' (11)''' ? Par rapport à la semaine dernière, chaque enfant est autre que X aujourd'hui. 'As compared to last week, each child is other than X today.'
Standard as partially elided comparative clause	(4)''' Paul a vu un autre film que [CP wh -film Marie a vu wh -film]. 'Paul watched another movie than [CP wh -movie Marie

²⁰ The predicative use of *autre* is better with a negation or in combination with *quelqu'un* 'someone':
(xiii) Ma sœur n'est autre que Claire. 'My sister is no other than Claire.'

('than [_{CP} remnant]')	<p>watched wh-movie.'</p> <p>(5)''' J'ai regardé un autre film que [_{CP} wh-film j'ai regardé wh-film hier].</p> <p>'I watched another movie than [_{CP} wh-movie I watched yesterday].'</p>
<p>Standard as fully elided comparative clause ('than [_{CP} X]')</p> <p>X is underspecified and can in particular be interpreted as a pronoun or a reflexive (but not as a reciprocal).</p>	<p>(12)''' Chaque critique a vu un autre film que [_{CP} wh-film X ont vu wh-film].</p> <p>'Each critic watched another movie than [_{CP} wh-movie X watched wh-movie].'</p> <p>(13)''' Paul et Claire ont vu un autre film que [_{CP} wh-film X ont vu wh-film].</p> <p>'Paul and Claire watched another movie than [_{CP} wh-movie X watched wh-movie].'</p>

Table 4: main cases with *autre*

Moreover, *autre* is also sensitive to islands. I illustrate this fact using sentences involving adjunct islands and one remnant in the comparative clause.

(96) # Luc est en colère parce qu'Anne a vaincu une autre personne que Paul.

'Luc is angry because Anne beat the same person as Paul.'

Intended interpretation: the person that made Luc angry because Anne beat her is another person than the person that made Paul angry because Anne beat her.

(97) * Une autre personne est en colère parce qu'Anne a vaincu Luc que Paul.

'Another person is angry because Anne beat Luc than Paul.'

Intended interpretation: the person that is angry because Anne beat Luc is another person than the person that is angry because Anne beat Paul.

3.2.2 Account for the differences with *différent*

These data show that the main difference between *différent* and *autre* concerns the reciprocal interpretation of the underspecified element, which is unavailable with *autre*:

(8)''' # Ces films sont autres.

'These movies are other.'

Intended interpretation: These movies are different from each other.

(9)''' # J'ai vu d'autres films pendant les vacances.

'I watched other movies during the holidays.'

Intended interpretation: I watched movies different from each other during the holidays.

(12)''' # Chaque critique a vu un autre film.

'Each critic watched another movie.'

Intended interpretation: Each critic watched a different movie than the other critics did.

(13)''' # Paul et Claire ont vu un autre film.

'Paul and Claire watched another movie.'

Intended interpretation: The movie that Paul watched is another movie than the movie that Claire watched.

In these four sentences, the silent complement can only be interpreted as a pronoun or a reflexive: for instance, (9)''' can mean that I watched movies other than, say, *Frida* during the holidays (pronominal interpretation) and (12)''' can mean that each critic watched another movie than the movie that (s)he watched the week before (reflexive interpretation).

My hypothesis is that the unavailability of reciprocal interpretations comes from a specific piece of meaning of *autre*: *autre* compares two individuals that have to be temporally ordered.²¹ This requirement of temporal succession makes *autre* an asymmetrical predicate, which precludes the reciprocal interpretation of the underspecified element.

(98) $\llbracket \textit{autre} \rrbracket = \lambda x. \lambda y. \exists P \in C, P(x)=1 \text{ and } P(y)=0 \text{ and } x < y$ (i.e. *x* temporally precedes *y*)

In fact, *autre* – unlike *différent* – has a meaning similar to that of ordinals and adjectives such as *nouveau* 'new' that involve individuals belonging to different time slots:

(99) a. Je voudrais un autre café/un deuxième café/#un café différent.

'I would like another coffee/a second coffee/#a different coffee.'

b. D'autres questions ? Vous désirez autre chose ?

'Other questions? Do you want anything else?'

c. J'ai commencé une autre carrière/une nouvelle carrière/#une carrière différente.

'I've started another career/a new career/#a different career.'

Also, this hypothesis is corroborated by the fact that when the factor of temporal ordering is controlled by the occurrence of *chaque* ('each') implying succession, a pseudo-reciprocal interpretation gets available with *autre*, as is the case with comparatives (cf. section 2.2.4.). *Autre* has a meaning close to *nouveau* 'new' in this case.

(100) a. Le pessimiste doit s'inventer chaque jour d'autres raisons d'exister.

'Every day, the pessimist must make up other reasons for existing.'

²¹ The counterpart of *autre* in the case of identity does not seem to be attested. This is probably because two objects that are identical under a token reading amount to a single object, so an ordering in time is not possible. It is only possible under type readings (two identical objects are then involved), but *autre* can precisely be used in this case (e.g. (99)a can involve a single kind of coffee, and in fact, *identique* 'identical' can replace *autre* in this very example).

- b. Chaque nouvelle génération a une autre idée sur la question.
'Each new generation has another idea on the question.'
- c. Chaque jour me fait découvrir une autre raison de l'admirer.
'Each day makes me discover another reason for admiring her.'

Similarly, (12)''' improves if we manipulate the context so that each critic is ordered in time, e.g. if each critic works on a different week.

Thus *autre* is similar to comparatives: its meaning intrinsically has an ordering component, which precludes reciprocal interpretations requiring symmetry. Otherwise, it is similar to *différent* in being a relational adjective that can combine with comparative clauses.

4 Further issues

So far, we have seen that the proposed analysis allows us to treat all cases involving *différent*, *même* and *autre* in a uniform way. In this section, we will examine two tricky cases that have contributed to motivating other kinds of analysis: cases involving multiple times and events (section 4.1), and cases involving several *sidi* terms in the same sentence (section 4.2). We will see that after closer look, these cases do not require a different treatment.

4.1 Further kinds of licensors

In the previous sections, we have examined examples involving licensors in the individual domain. But it appears that *sidi* terms can also take other kinds of licensors: Carlson (1987) and Moltmann (1992) show that *same* and *different* are not only licensed by distributive DPs, but also by conjoined PPs, conjoined Ps, conjoined VPs, conjoined Vs, conjoined APs and possibly conjoined AdvS, as illustrated by the following examples.

- (101) a. Different people discovered America and invented bifocals.
 b. John saw and reviewed different films.
 c. Max put different plates on the table and in the cupboard.
 d. Different people voted for and against the proposal.
 e. John painted different houses very red and somewhat blue.
 f. (?) John does different tasks eagerly and grudgingly. (from Carlson 1987: 538)

This kind of examples motivated analyses in terms of events (cf. Carlson 1987, Moltmann 1992, Author 2011).

However, note that all examples involved in (101) contain plural DPs with *different*. Thus they can be analyzed as taking an implicit underspecified DP interpreted as a reciprocal as discussed in section 2.1.2, and the covers determining the relevant interpretation are

determined pragmatically. For instance in (101)b, the partition of the movies can be made along the dimension of what John did to them {movies seen by John; movies reviewed by John}.

Nevertheless, the same kind of examples as (101) can involve singular *même*:

- (102) a. Le même homme composait des opéras et s'endettait régulièrement.
'The same man composed operas and got into debts.'
b. Le même homme composait et jouait des sonates.
'The same man composed and played sonatas.'
c. Le même homme aimait peindre dans son atelier et à l'extérieur.
'The same man liked painting in his studio and outside.'
d. Le même homme a voté pour et contre le projet de loi.
'The same man voted for and against the bill.'
e. Luc a peint le même jouet en rouge et en bleu.
'Luc painted the same toy in red and in blue.'
g. Luc a cuisiné le même plat hier et aujourd'hui.
'Luc cooked the same meal yesterday and today.'

Moreover, *même* is not only licensed by conjoined elements, but also by other contexts involving plural events (see also Laca and Tasmowski, 2001: ex. 46-48 for similar sentences). They involve several possible aspectual notions (frequentativity, iterativity, habituativity, continuativity, durativity), which can be expressed by several categories (verbs, adverbs, preverbs, nouns, adjectives).

- (103) a. Lucie commet souvent la même erreur.
'Lucy often makes the same mistake.'
b. Antoine a lu le même livre plusieurs fois.
'Antoine read the same book several times.'
c. Le film s'arrête à chaque fois sur la même image.
'The movie stops every time on the same picture.'
- (104) a. La répétition de la même erreur n'est pas acceptable.
'The repetition of the same mistake is not acceptable.'
b. La deuxième/troisième/quatrième édition du même livre
'The second/third/fourth edition of the same book.'
- (105) a. Il invite habituellement la même personne chez lui.
'He usually invites the same person at his place.'
b. Il avait coutume d'inviter la même personne chez lui.
'He used to invite the same person at his place.'

(106) a. Il est difficile de continuer à travailler dans la même entreprise quand on aime le changement.

'It is hard to keep working in the same company when one likes changes.'

b. Le maintien dans le même établissement est de règle pour tout étudiant admis en seconde année ou autorisé à redoubler. [google]

'The maintenance in the same establishment is usual for every student admitted in second year or permitted to repeat the year.'

c. Il a un désir constant/continu du même objet.

'He has a constant/continuous desire of the same object.'

(107) a. Annie fait le même repas pour Noël depuis 20 ans.

'Annie has made the same meal for Christmas for 20 years.'

b. Cela fait longtemps que Marc habite au même endroit.

'Marc has been living at the same place for a long time.'

c. Paul a habité au même endroit pendant toute sa jeunesse.

'Paul was living at the same place during his whole youth.'

d. La durée d'habitation dans le même logement est limitée.

'The period of habitation in the same housing is limited.'

e. Une habitation prolongée dans le même logement pourrait poser problème.

'Extended habitation in the same housing could pose problems.'

I hypothesize that this is due to the meaning of identity: two objects that are the same at different times amount to a single object. Therefore, we can simply suppose that the silent complement of *même* in these cases is interpreted as a reflexive. In fact, indefinites like *un N identique* ('an identical N') or *un seul N* ('a single N') can replace the DP with *même* in all these sentences and yield the same interpretation, which demonstrates that these sentences do not require a specific analysis for *même*.

(102)' a. Un seul homme composait des opéras et s'endettait régulièrement.

'A single man composed operas and got into debts.'

g. Luc a cuisiné un plat identique hier et aujourd'hui.

'Luc cooked an identical meal yesterday and today.'

Strikingly, similar examples with singular *différent* are hardly acceptable.

(102)a" ?? Un homme différent composait des opéras et s'endettait régulièrement.

'A different man composed operas and got into debts.'

This is because the reflexive interpretation of the silent complement is contradictory in this case under a token reading, since two objects need to be involved.

However, we saw that the silent complement of *différent* can be interpreted as a reflexive in certain conditions (cf. (11)'), i.e. if we deal with a single individual that changes over time. In fact, (102)" becomes acceptable under this interpretation, i.e. if we

understand that only one man is involved (i.e. Mozart) but he is in different states of mind when he composes operas and gets into debts.

The only available example that involves two different objects with singular *différent* is the equivalent of (103)c:

(103)c' Le film s'arrête à chaque fois/toujours sur une image différente.

'The movie stops every time/always on a different picture.'

This example involves a universal quantifier of time. Thus the proposed analysis can be extended to this case if we assume that the silent elements do not necessarily refer to individuals, but can also be variables in other domains such as times; note that such variables have independently been argued for (cf. Partee: 1989). This can be represented and paraphrased as below.

(108) a. Le film s'arrête toujours sur une image différente de [_{CP} ~~wh-image il s'arrête~~
~~wh-image~~ X_{reciprocal}].

'The movie always stops on a different picture than [_{CP} ~~wh-picture it stopped~~
~~wh-picture~~ X_{reciprocal}].'

b. Le film s'arrête toujours sur une image différente de celle sur laquelle il s'arrête les autres fois.

'The movie always stops on a different picture than the one on which it stopped at other times.'

Thus the type of examples that motivated analyses in terms of events can be accounted for by the proposed analysis: just as in examples analyzed previously, *sidi* terms involve a silent underspecified complement in these cases, which can belong to the domain of times.²²

4.2 Double *sidi* term in the same sentence

Further tricky examples are as follows.

²² As noted by a reviewer, *différent* can be used to compare clausal elements as in (xiv):

(xiv) Voyager seul est différent de voyager en groupe.

'To travel alone is different than to travel with a group.'

It seems that these clausal elements are treated like (abstract) individuals in those cases: 'to travel' is equivalent to 'the fact of travelling', 'a travel'. The fact that equivalent sentences with *même* have to involve the noun *chose* 'thing' as shown in (xv) support this hypothesis. The construction in (xvi) with *différent* also contains *chose*.

(xv) Voyager seul n'est pas la même chose que (de) voyager en groupe.

'To travel alone is not the same thing as to travel with a group.'

(xvi) Voyager seul et voyager en groupe sont deux choses différentes.

'To travel alone and to travel with a group are two different things.'

A detailed examination of such examples is nevertheless beyond the scope of this paper.

- (109) a. Les mêmes enfants ont fait les mêmes erreurs.
 'The same children made the same mistakes.'
 b. Différents linguistes sont allés à différentes conférences.
 'Different linguists went to different conferences.'

They have posed problems to most previous analyses because they seem to require mutual binding of variables. In particular, scope-based analyses propose that the *sidi* term is a quantifier moving to the right position with respect to the licensor to get interpreted (cf. a.o. Barker 2007): this predicts infinite recursion in these sentences, since the licensor and the target need to be conversely the target and the licensor at the same time (at LF).

According to Keenan (1992: 202), a sentence such as (109)b would mean (on its weakest reading) that there are at least two linguists and for all distinct linguists *x*, *y*, the conferences that *x* went to are not exactly the same as the conferences *y* went to: according to him, the iterated use of *different* guarantees (minimally) a one-to-one match between linguists and sets of conferences (as well as the existence of at least two linguists). Thus *different linguists* and *different conferences* are not interpreted independently according to him.

However, this kind of sentence can get weaker and vaguer interpretations than what Keenan claims: an exact one-to-one match between linguists and sets of conference is not necessary. Thus (109)b could be utterable and deemed true in situations where many linguists went to many conferences and two of them went to exactly the same set of conferences. Moreover, note that (109) involves plural DPs. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suppose that (109) involves silent underspecified complements as in e.g. (10)', which can be interpreted based on pragmatically determined covers. (109)b is roughly paraphrasable as "linguists different from each other went to conferences different from each other" exhibiting many more interpretations, more or less pragmatically plausible; the only requirement is that linguists differ from each other along some dimension and conferences too (see Author 2012 for more detail).

In sum, given that the examples that seem to be problematic for most analyses involve *sidi* terms occurring in plural DPs, the present analysis can apply to them since the various interpretations of such cases can depend on pragmatics.

5 Comparison with other analyses and other languages

In this last section, I will briefly compare the present analysis to previous ones and see how it could extend to other languages than French.

5.1 Comparison with previous analyses

5.1.1 The goals of the present analysis

What the present paper has strived to achieve (for French) is to derive all constructions involving *different*, *same* and *other* in a uniform way, i.e. without postulating different lexical entries. This is done by relating *sidi* terms to relational terms and comparatives so that no specific mechanism needs to be postulated: in a nutshell, *sidi* terms are comparatives of individuals. Theoretically, this approach is motivated by ideals of economy, and empirically, by the observation that most languages (all languages surveyed in the appendix) present the same term for *same* through all constructions. Nevertheless, note that we have distinguished between two subcases depending on whether the individual corresponding to the standard is projected as a DP or a CP (comparative clause interpreted as a free relative) just as has been argued for comparatives by linguists assuming the existence of phrasal vs. clausal comparatives (cf. a.o. Hankamer 1973, Napoli 1983). Moreover, we have assumed that some apparent DPs correspond to reduced comparative clauses (cf. section 2.2.1.) just as some other linguists suppose that apparent phrasal comparatives involve reduced comparative clauses (cf. a.o. Heim 1985, Hackl 2000, Lechner 2001, Pancheva 2006).

- (4)' Paul a vu un film différent de Marie.
'Paul watched a different movie than Marie.'

- (5)' J'ai regardé un film différent d'hier.
'I watched a different movie than yesterday.'

We have done so in cases where the DP in question (e.g. *Marie* in (4)', *yesterday* in (5)') cannot directly correspond to the standard due to its meaning. Moreover, island facts argue for the presence of an elided clause.

But what about cases like (2)' where the DP directly corresponds to the standard?

- (2)' J'ai vu un film différent de ce film-là.
'I watched a movie different from this one.'

In (2)', *ce film-là* ('this movie') directly denotes the standard since *différent* here compares two movies.

As we have mentioned, similar cases are possible with regular comparatives:

- (18) J'ai vu un film plus intéressant que ce film-là.
'I watched a movie more interesting than this one.'

We could make the analysis even more unified by supposing that these cases also involve reduced comparative clauses with the verb *être* 'be'.

- (2)' J'ai vu un film différent de ce qu'est ce film-là.
'I watched a movie different than what this one is.'

- (18) J'ai vu un film plus intéressant que ne l'est ce film-là.
'I watched a movie more interesting than this one is.'

This would make *sidi* terms closer to comparatives than to relational adjectives; and indeed, relational adjectives do not have the same behavior as *sidi* terms because they cannot combine with comparative clauses (as explained in section 2.2.4) while the difference with comparatives comes from the asymmetrical meaning of comparatives (required for the reciprocal interpretation), which is also observed with *autre*.

This hypothesis is therefore attractive, in particular for *même* and *autre* that require the same linker as comparatives, namely *que*. However, the nature of the linker and the possibility of selecting comparative clauses do not completely correlate. In particular, *différent* usually requires the linker *de* (*que* is colloquial), i.e. the same linker as many relational terms (e.g. *ennemi* 'enemy') that do not license comparative clauses; conversely, *pareil* 'similar' requires the linker *que*, i.e. the same linker as comparatives, but does not license comparative clauses. Also, the split between DP and CP cases will allow us to account for other possibilities of lexicalization in other languages in section 5.2, which would be harder to do under a fully unified analysis. For these reasons, I here choose to distinguish between the DP and the CP cases, but it would be worth further investigating whether *sidi* terms could be analyzed as always taking CP complements.

5.1.2 Previous analyses

To the best of my knowledge, the present analysis differs from previous ones in aiming at relating all constructions involving *different*, *same* and *other*, and in proposing no specific mechanism for these terms but in relating them to comparatives and relational terms. Below are some illustrations of this difference, but obviously, I cannot be exhaustive nor detailed about previous analyses.

Barker (2007)'s proposal is radically different: he concentrates on the internal reading of *same* (cases such as (12)' or (13)'), which he analyzes as a quantificational adjective taking parasitic scope over some other scope-taking element, and this analysis is implemented within an innovative continuation-based Type-Logical Grammar. Thus under this analysis, the internal reading is not related to other constructions involving *same*, but receives a specific analysis unrelated to other elements of the language like comparatives or relational terms.

Dowty (1985), Carlson (1987) and Moltmann (1992) group some of the constructions together, but none of these analyses relates constructions involving linkers with those without linkers. Dowty (1985) analyzes the discourse anaphoric interpretation and the internal reading such as (12)' as cases of anaphora by giving an important role to pragmatics. Carlson (1987) and Moltmann (1992) treat (12)' or (13)' in a similar way by taking *different* to distribute over plural events; thus the internal reading is not related to constructions with linkers under these proposals, and *same* and *different* are specific and unrelated to comparatives and relational terms.

Brasoveanu (2011) proposes a unified account of sentence-external and sentence-

internal readings of singular *different* in a stack-based dynamic system couched in type logic. But he distinguishes between singular *different*, plural *different* and *same* and only focuses on constructions without linkers; thus he does not relate *different* to comparatives and relational terms.

Heim (1985) however suggests to relate *different* with comparatives, but she does not discuss internal readings like (12)' or reciprocal interpretations.

Beck (2000) is closer in spirit to the present analysis since she groups several cases together. In particular, she explicitly relates *different* to relational terms and comparatives. But based on German, she proposes two lexical entries for *different*: one corresponding to a relational term (German *verschieden*, which denotes a relation between two individuals) and one corresponding to a comparison operator (German *anders*, which expresses a relation between a pair of individuals and a relation between two individuals). Note that this leads to a homonymy hypothesis for *same* too, which is not supported by the German data (this issue is not evoked by Beck): the distinction between German *selb* and *gleich* reflects the independent type/token distinction very much like *same* vs. *identical*, and thus does not align with the difference between *anders* and *verschieden*; *selb* and *gleich* do not appear in different constructions and thus do not support the hypothesis of a split between two sets of cases. Instead of supposing two different entries like Beck (2000), I here propose that *different* always selects two individuals, but the standard can either be a DP or a CP. Thus in the *anders* case, I assume the presence of an elided comparative clause (interpreted as a free relative, thus denoting an individual) while Beck builds it into the lexical entry of *anders*. The present analysis has the advantage of directly accounting for the island facts: Beck (2000) does account for why *verschieden* is not subject to islands as mentioned in section 2.1.2, but it is less clear how all island facts derive from her analysis of *anders*. Furthermore, I suppose underspecification of (part of) the complement of *sidi* terms, which correctly predicts interpretations that are not mentioned by Beck (2000) such as reflexive ones. In short, the present analysis is similar to Beck's concerning the cases with DP complements; but the cases that I analyze as taking elided comparative clauses correspond to a different lexical entry in her analysis.

In sum, the previous analyses of *same* or *different* – to my knowledge – propose several lexical entries for these terms and rarely relate them to other elements like relational terms or comparatives, but postulate specific mechanisms to account for them. In this paper, I however strived to propose a uniform, non-specific analysis of *sidi* terms.

5.2 Comparison with other languages

Beyond theoretical economy, the main motivation for my enterprise is empirical: *sidi* terms – in particular *same* – usually exhibit the same item through all constructions as illustrated in appendix A in a range of various languages, and the presence of homonymy in so many languages seems dubious. Nevertheless, it remains the case that *different* can be lexicalized in different ways as shown e.g. in Beck (2000) for German.

How do we explain the possibility of various lexicalizations if we assume a unified account for all cases?

The possibility of several lexical entries for *sidi* terms can come from two sources. First, as we have seen for French *différent* vs. *autre*, two *sidi* terms can differ on dimensions that are independent from the variety of cases explained here even if they can interact: *autre* includes an additional meaning component, i.e. requires ordering in time; the difference between *selb* and *gleich* corresponds to the difference between token and type readings. More generally, *sidi* terms can be lexicalized differently depending on how difference and identity are conceptualized, but this issue is orthogonal to ours, i.e. the existence of various constructions involving *sidi* terms. The second source is however related to our issue and is represented e.g. by the distinction between German *verschieden* and *anders*. We have distinguished between cases where the standard selected by the *sidi* term is projected as a DP and cases where it is a comparative clause; these two selectional subcases can correlate with two different lexicalizations as I assume is the case in German. Based on the data in the appendix, this seems to only occur with *different*, not with *same*. But this apparent difference vanishes if we incorporate other relational terms expressing identity like *identical*: *identical* seems to be the counterpart of *verschieden* in that it only selects DPs, not comparative clauses. Thus the possibility of selecting comparative clauses or not can determine different lexicalizations. This is usually reflected by the nature of the linker, similar or not to that of comparatives, but not always (cf French *différent* selecting *de* like relational terms or *que* like comparatives). As already mentioned, this occasional mismatch between linkers and selectional restriction is a mystery that would require further investigation.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, I strived to account for all uses of *sidi* terms in a unified way without resorting to specific mechanisms. The main argument for endorsing this approach is the strong crosslinguistic evidence with respect to the identity term equivalent to *same*: in all the languages that I have surveyed (see appendix A), only one term is devoted to all constructions; this strongly suggests that all the readings should be derived from a unique lexical entry.

This analysis relates *sidi* terms to both relational terms and comparatives and it is based on the possible presence of underspecified silent elements that can be pragmatically interpreted in different ways. Here is a summary of all readings with *sidi* terms:

Case	Explanation	Examples involving <i>différent</i>
Standard as overt DP ('from DP')	The complement of the <i>sidi</i> term is an explicit DP mediated by a linker.	(1) 'Lucie est différente de Claire. 'Lucie is different from Claire.' (2) J'ai vu un film différent de ce film-là. 'I watched a movie different from this one.' (3) Paul a vu un film différent de ce que proposait Marie.

		'Paul watched a different movie than what Marie proposed.'
Standard as implicit DP ('from X')	The complement of the <i>sidi</i> term is a silent DP that is underspecified. It can be pragmatically interpreted as an anaphoric or deictic pronoun, a reflexive, a reciprocal or more vaguely.	<p>(6)' Lucie est allée voir <i>Frida</i> hier. Moi, j'ai vu un film différent de X.</p> <p>'Lucie went and watched <i>Frida</i> yesterday. As for me, I watched a different movie from X.'</p> <p>(7)' [<i>Watching a trailer</i>] C'est un film différent de X que j'avais vu.</p> <p>'It is a different from X movie that I had watched.'</p> <p>(8)' Ces films sont différents de X.</p> <p>'These movies are different from X.'</p> <p>(9)' J'ai vu des films différents de X pendant les vacances.</p> <p>'I watched different movies from X during the holidays.'</p> <p>(10)' Les critiques ont vu des films différents de X.</p> <p>'The critics watched different movies.'</p> <p>(11)' Par rapport à la semaine dernière, chaque enfant est différent de X aujourd'hui.</p> <p>'As compared to last week, each child is different from X today.'</p>
Standard as partially elided comparative clause ('than [_{CP} remnant]')	The complement of the <i>sidi</i> term is a partially elided comparative clause.	<p>(4)' Paul a vu un film différent de [_{CP} wh-film Marie a vu wh-film].</p> <p>'Paul watched a different movie than [_{CP} wh-movie Marie watched wh-movie].</p> <p>(5)' J'ai regardé un film différent de [_{CP} wh-film j'ai regardé wh-film hier].</p> <p>'I watched a different movie than [_{CP} wh-movie I watched yesterday].'</p>
Standard as fully elided comparative clause ('than [_{CP} X]')	The complement of the <i>sidi</i> term is a comparative clause that is fully elided and contains a silent underspecified pronoun, which can in particular be interpreted as a pronoun, a reflexive or a reciprocal	<p>(12)' Chaque critique a vu un film différent de [_{CP} wh-film X ont vu wh-film].</p> <p>'Each critic watched a different movie than [_{CP} wh-movie X watched wh-movie].'</p> <p>(13)' Paul et Claire ont vu un film différent de [_{CP} wh-film X ont vu wh-film].</p> <p>'Paul and Claire watched a different movie than [_{CP} wh-movie X watched wh-movie].'</p>

Table 5: Summary of all cases

Thus this analysis rests on the combination of different independently required mechanisms, so that the use of the same term in all uses (cf. equivalent of *same* in all languages surveyed) is expected. However, it also makes possible specific lexicalizations since several parameters are involved (selection of DP/CP, meaning specificities...). The study of more crosslinguistic data would be useful to further elaborate an analysis that does not force multiplication of lexical entries when it is not empirically motivated, but makes it possible when it is observed. In particular, it would

allow us to better understand what impact the nature of linkers has on the variety of constructions involving *sidi* terms.

7 Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Philippe Schlenker, Benjamin Spector and Dominique Sportiche for helpful comments and discussion. I am also very grateful to all the people who generously answered my crosslinguistic survey, in particular Sameer ud Dowla Khan, Lilit Kocharyan, Grace Kuo, José María Lahoz Bengoechea, Walter Lee, Felipe Lopez, Asuka Matsumoto, Antonio Mele, Pam Munro, WeiSong Ong, Öner Özçelik, Denis Paperno, Fernanda Pratas, Ankelien Shippers, Catherine Willmond and Phran Zutha.

8 References

- Alrenga, Peter, 2007: *Dimensions in the semantics of comparatives*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Barker, Chris, 2007: "Parasitic Scope". *Linguistic and Philosophy* 30. 407–444.
- Beck, Sigrid, 2000: "The Semantics of *different*. Comparison Operator and Relational Adjective". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23, 101-139.
- Brasoveanu, Adrian, 2011: "Sentence-internal *different* as Quantifier-internal Anaphora". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 34: 93-168.
- Caponigro, Ivano, 2004: "The semantic contribution of wh-words and type shifts: Evidence from free relatives crosslinguistically". *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) XIV*, R. Young (ed.), 38-55. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications, Cornell University.
- Carlson, Greg, 1987: *Same and Different*: some Consequences for Syntax and Semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 10.
- Chomsky, Noam, 1977: "On *Wh*-Movement". P. Culicover, T. Wasow and A. Akmajian (eds.) *Formal Syntax*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo, 2010: *The Syntax of adjectives: a Comparative Study*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 57. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA.
- Dotlačil, Jakub, 2010: *Anaphora and Distributivity. A study of same, different, reciprocals and others*, Doctoral Dissertation, Utrecht Institute for Linguistics OTS, LOT Series.
- Dowty, David, 1985: "A Unified Indexical Analysis of *Same* and *Different*, A Response to Stump and Carlson", Paper presented at the University of Texas Workshop on Syntax and Semantics, Austin, Texas, March 22–24, 1985.
- Farkas, Donka, 1981: "Quantifier scope and syntactic islands". *CLS* 17, 59-66.
- Fox, Danny, 2000: *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*. MIT Press.
- Fox, Danny, 2002: "Antecedent Contained Deletion and the Copy Theory of Movement". *Linguistic Inquiry* 33.1, 63-96.
- Hackl, Martin, 2000: *Comparative Quantifiers*. PhD thesis. MIT.
- Hankamer, Jorge, 1973: "Why there are two than's in English". *Chicago Linguistics Society*, 179-91.

- Heim, Irene, 1985: "Notes on Comparatives and Related Matters". Ms, University of Texas, Austin.
- Heim, Irene, 1997: "Predicates or Formulas? Evidence from Ellipsis". In A. Lawson (ed.) *Proceedings of SALT 7*, CLC, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, 197-221.
- Heim, Irene, 2000: "Degree Operators and Scope". *SALT X*, Cornell University, 40-64.
- Keenan, Edward, 1992: "Beyond the Frege Boundary". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 15 (2). 199 - 221.
- Kennedy, Christopher, 1997: "Antecedent Contained Deletion and the Syntax of Quantification". *Linguistic Inquiry* 28-4.
- Kennedy, Christopher, 1999: *Projecting the Adjective: The Syntax and Semantics of Gradability and Comparison*. Garland Press, New York.
- Kennedy, Christopher, 2002: "Comparative Deletion and Optimality in Syntax". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20.3, 553-621.
- Laca, Brenda and Liliane Tasmowski, 2001: "Distributivité et interprétations dépendantes des expressions d'identité". In G. Kleiber, B. Laca and L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Typologie des groupes nominaux*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 143-166.
- Lechner, Winfried, 2001: "Reduced and phrasal comparatives". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19, 683-735.
- Loebner, Sebastian, 1987: "The Conceptual Nature of Natural Language Quantification". I. Ruzsa and A. Szabolcsi (eds.), *Proceedings of the '87 Debrecen Symposium on Logic and Language*, Akademiai Kiado, Budapest.
- Magri, Giorgio, 2014: "An Account for the Homogeneity Effects triggered by Plural Definites and Conjunction based on Double Strengthening". *Semantics, Pragmatics and the Case of Scalar Implicatures*; Salvatore Pistoia Reda (ed.); Palgrave.
- Matushansky, Ora and Eddy Ruys, 2007: "Same in Russian". Paper presented at *FSiM 3*, April 28, 2007, Moscow.
- Moltmann, Friederike, 1992: "Reciprocals and *same/different*: towards a Semantic Analysis". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 15. 411-462.
- Napoli, Donna-Jo, 1983: "Comparative Ellipsis: A Phrase Structure Account". *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 4, 675-694.
- Pancheva, Roumyana, 2006: "Phrasal and Clausal Comparatives in Slavic". *FASL* 14, 236-257.
- Partee, Barbara, 1989: "Binding Implicit Variables in Quantified Contexts". *CLS* 25.
- Rett, Jessica, 2010: "Equatives, measure phrases and NPIs". *Amsterdam Colloquium Proceedings*.
- Schwarzschild, Roger, 1993: "Plurals, Presuppositions and the Sources of Distributivity". *Natural Language Semantics* 2, 201-248.
- Schwarzschild, Roger, 1996: *Pluralities*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Solomon, Mike, 2009: "Partitives and the Semantics of *same*". *Sinn und Bedeutung* 14 handout.

Sportiche, Dominique, 2005: "Division of Labor between Merge and Move: Strict Locality of Selection and Apparent Reconstruction Paradoxes". *Proceedings of the Workshop Divisions of Linguistic Labor, The La Bretesche Workshop*.

Szabolcsi, Anna, 1997: 'Strategies for Scope Taking'. Szabolcsi (ed) *Ways of Scope Taking*, Kluwer, 109-154.

Tovena, Lucia and Marleen Van Peteghem, 2006: "La place de *différent* dans le syntagme nominal et les déterminants". In *Indéfinis et Prédications*, Francis Corblin, Sylvie Ferrando et Lucien Kupferman (eds.). Presses Universitaires de Paris-Sorbonne. 449-460.

Van Peteghem, Marleen, 1997: "Sur un indéfini marginal: *même* exprimant l'identité". *Langue française* 116, 61-80.

Appendix

A. Crosslinguistic data about *same* and *different*

The following charts present data about *sidi* terms in different language families:

- 9 Indoeuropean languages: 3 Germanic languages (English, German and Dutch); 4 Romance languages (French, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese), 1 Slavic language (Russian), 1 Armenian language, 1 Indo-Iranian language (Bengali)
- 1 Semitic language (Hebrew)
- 2 Altaic languages (Turkish, Japanese; but this family is controversial, this may correspond to two different families)
- 1 Tai language (Thai)
- 1 Sino-Tibetan language (Taiwanese)
- 1 Austronesian language (Malay)
- 1 Bantu language (Swahili)
- 1 Muskogean language (Chickasaw)
- 1 Oto-Maguean language (Zapotec)

This sample is not balanced across families, and has been constituted informally. Nevertheless, it suggests that the main tendency is as follows: languages present one term for *same* across the main cases studied in the article, but possibly different ones for *different*. It would be interesting to test this claim with a more controlled and representative survey.

A.1. Crosslinguistic data about *same*²³

Most languages present only one word for *same* in the different cases that have been examined in the article (only some of them are represented below for space reasons).

Moreover, when languages present several words for *same*, these different words are not distributed over the mentioned constructions (e.g. one for the external reading, the other one for the internal reading), but they differ on other dimensions (cf. type/token reading in German *gleich* vs. *selb*) that are not relevant in this paper.

Other languages (e.g. Russian, Swahili) do not appear to express identity in the same way (there does not seem to be any corresponding adjective meaning *same*); these cases would need further investigation (see Matushansky and Ruys: 2007 for more about *same* in Russian).

	Plural sentence-internal case	Quantified sentence-internal case	Sentence-external case	Case with overt linker
English	<i>the same</i>	<i>the same</i>	<i>the same</i>	<i>the same as</i>
	<i>Anne and Mike read the same book.</i>	<i>Every child read the same book.</i>	<i>Paul decided to read the Odyssey. I chose the same book.</i>	<i>I read the same book as Paul.</i>
French	<i>le même</i>	<i>le même</i>	<i>le même</i>	<i>le même que</i>
	<i>Anne et Michel ont lu le même livre.</i>	<i>Chaque enfant a lu le même livre.</i>	<i>Paul a décidé de lire l'Odyssée. J'ai choisi le même livre.</i>	<i>J'ai lu le même livre que Paul.</i>
Italian	<i>lo stesso</i>	<i>lo stesso</i>	<i>lo stesso</i>	<i>lo stesso di</i>
	<i>Anne e Michel hanno letto lo stesso libro.</i>	<i>Ogni bambino ha letto lo stesso libro.</i>	<i>Paul ha deciso di leggere l'Odissea. Io ho scelto lo stesso libro.</i>	<i>Io ho letto lo stesso libro di Paul.</i>
Spanish	<i>el mismo</i>	<i>el mismo</i>	<i>el mismo</i>	<i>el mismo que</i>
	<i>Ana y Miguel leyeron el mismo libro.</i>	<i>Todos los niños leyeron el mismo libro.</i>	<i>Pablo decidió leer la Odisea. Yo elegí el mismo libro.</i>	<i>Yo leí el mismo libro que Pablo.</i>
Portuguese	<i>o mesmo</i>	<i>o mesmo</i>	<i>o mesmo</i>	<i>o mesmo que</i>
	<i>A Anne e o Mike leram o mesmo livro.</i>	<i>Todas as crianças leram o mesmo livro.</i>	<i>O Paul decidiu ler a Odisseia. Eu escolhi o mesmo livro.</i>	<i>Eu li o mesmo livro que o Paul.</i>
Dutch	<i>hetzelfde</i> the.same	<i>hetzelfde</i> the.same	<i>hetzelfde/datzelfde</i> the.same/that	<i>hetzelfde als</i> the.same as
	<i>Anne en Mike lezen hetzelfde boek.</i>	<i>Ieder kind leest hetzelfde boek.</i>	<i>Paul besloot de Odysseus te lezen. Ik koos hetzelfde/datzelfde boek.</i>	<i>Ik lees hetzelfde boek als Paul.</i>

²³ The abbreviations used in tables (A1) and (A2) are the following ones: ACC: accusative; CL: classifier; CMP: complement; COR: correlative; DAT: dative; DEF: definite; DEM: demonstrative; DS: different subject; EMP: emphatic; FOC: focus; GEN: genitive; INF: infinitive; M: masculine; NEG: negation; NOM: nominative; PL: plural; PR: present tense; PRF: perfect tense; PST: past tense; REL: relative; SP: specificity marker; SG: singular; SS: same subject; TEMP: temporal dependency; TOP: topic.

German	<i>der/die/das gleiche</i> (type reading) <i>derselbe/dieselbe</i> /dasselbe (token reading)	<i>der/die/das gleiche</i> (type reading) <i>derselbe/dieselbe</i> /dasselbe (token reading)	<i>der/die/das gleiche</i> (type reading) <i>derselbe/dieselbe</i> /dasselbe (token reading)	<i>der/die/das gleiche</i> (type reading) <i>derselbe/dieselbe</i> /dasselbe (token reading)
	<i>Anne und Mike haben das gleiche Buch gelesen.</i>	<i>Jedes Kind hat das gleiche Buch gelesen.</i>	<i>Paul hat sich entschlossen, die Odyssee zu lesen. Ich habe mich für das gleiche Buch entschieden.</i>	<i>Ich habe das gleiche Buch wie Paul gelesen.</i>
Russian	<i>odnu i tu zhe</i> one and that EMP	<i>odnu i tu zhe</i> one and that EMP	<i>etu zhe (samuju)</i> this EMP (very)	<i>tu zhe (samuju)...,</i> that EMP (very) ..., <i>chto</i> that
	<i>Anja i Misha</i> Anya and Misha <i>pro-ch-l-i odnu</i> PRF-read- PST- PL one <i>i tu zhe knigu</i> and that EMP book.	<i>Kazhdyj rebjonok</i> every child <i>pro-chjo-l odnu</i> PRF-read-PST:SG one <i>i tu zhe knigu.</i> and that EMP book.	<i>Pasha reshil</i> Paul decided <i>pro-ches-t' Odisseju.</i> PRF-read-INF Odyssey. <i>Ja vybra-l etu zhe</i> I choose-PST this EMP (<i>samuju</i>) <i>knigu</i> (very) book	<i>Ja pro-chjo-l tu</i> I PRF-read-PST:SG that <i>zhe (samuju) knigu,</i> EMP (very) book <i>chto i Pasha.</i> that and Paul.
Armenian	<i>en nujn</i>	<i>en nujn</i>	<i>nujn</i>	<i>en nujn inch vor</i>
	<i>Annan u Majk@</i> <i>kardum en nujn</i> <i>girk@:</i>	<i>Bolor (all) erexaner@</i> <i>kardum en nujn</i> <i>girk@:</i>	<i>Pol@ voroshec kardal</i> <i>Vodisakan@: Yes</i> <i>@ntreci nujn girk@:</i>	<i>Yes kardum em nujn</i> <i>girk@, inch vor Pol@:</i>
Bengali	<i>εki</i> one-EMP	<i>εki</i> one-EMP	a) <i>εki</i> one-EMP b) <i>fej boj-ta-j</i> COR book-DEF-EMP that (exact.)book	a) <i>εki</i> one-EMP b) <i>dzej ... fe-ta</i> REL... COR-DEF which...that one
	<i>/ɛn aɪ majk ɛk-i</i> Ann and Mike one-EMP <i>boj por-e-tɕʰ-e/</i> book read-PRF-be-3	<i>/pɔtʰ:ek-ta batɕ:a</i> every-one-CL child <i>ɛk-i boj</i> one-EMP book <i>por-e-tɕʰ-e/</i> read-PRF-be-3	<i>/pɔl ɔdisi pɔr-a-ɪ</i> Paul Od. read-INF-GEN <i>mon tʰik koɪ-l-o.</i> mind fix do-PST-3. <i>ami-o fej boj-ta-j</i> I-also COR book-DEF-EMP <i>betɕʰ-e ni-l-am/</i> choose-PRF take-PST-1	<i>/ami aɪ pɔl ɛk-i</i> I and Paul one-EMP <i>boj por-e-tɕʰ-i/</i> book read-PRF-be-1 <i>/pɔl dzej boj-ta</i> Paul REL book-DEF <i>por-e-tɕʰ-e,</i> read-PRF-be-3, <i>fe-ta ami-o</i> COR-DEF I-also <i>por-e-tɕʰ-i/</i> read-PRF-be-1
Hebrew	<i>?oto</i> same-SG	<i>?oto</i> same-SG	<i>?oto</i> same-SG	<i>?oto</i> same-SG
	<i>An u-Maik qor?im</i> A. and-M. read.3PL <i>?et ?oto ha-sefer.</i> ACC same.SG DEF-book	<i>kol ha-yeladim qor?im</i> all DEF-children read.3PL <i>?et ?oto ha-sefer,</i> ACC same.SG DEF-book	<i>pol hihliṯ liqro?</i> Paul decide.PST read-INF <i>?et ha-odise?a. ani</i> ACC DEF-Odyssey I <i>baḥar-ti</i> choose.PST-1SG	<i>?ani qore ?oto sefer</i> I read same book <i>kmo pol</i> as Paul

			<i>be-ʔoto ha-sefer.</i> in-same.SG DEF-book.	
Turkish	<i>aynı ...-i</i> same ...-SP	<i>aynı ...-i</i> same ...-SP	<i>aynı ...-i</i> same ...-SP	<i>'la aynı ...-i</i> same ...-SP as
	<i>Anne ve Mike aynı</i> Anne and Mike same <i>kitab-ı oku-du</i> book-SP read-PST	<i>Her çocuk aynı</i> Every child same <i>kitab-ı oku-du</i> book-SP read-PST	<i>Paul Odyssey'i</i> Paul Odyssey-SP <i>oku-ma-y-a karar</i> read-INF-buffer-DAT- <i>ver-di. Ben de aynı</i> decide-PST. I too same <i>kitab-ı seç-ti-m.</i> book-SP choose-PST-1SG	<i>Paul'la aynı</i> Paul-with same <i>kitab-ı oku-du-m</i> book-SP read-PST-1SG
Thai	<i>diew เดียว</i> <i>deīyw</i>	<i>diew</i> <i>deīyw</i>	<i>diew</i> <i>deīyw</i>	<i>diew</i> <i>deīyw</i>
	<i>Anne gub Mike arn'</i> <i>nung seu lem diew</i> <i>gun.</i>	<i>dek took kon arn'</i> <i>nung seu lem diew</i> <i>gun.</i>	<i>Paul tud sin jai tee ja</i> <i>arn' Odyssey. chun</i> <i>luek tee ja arn nung</i> <i>seu lem diew gun.</i>	<i>chun arn nung seu</i> <i>lem diew gun gub</i> <i>Paul.</i>
Taiwanese	<i>kang khuan e</i> same type REL	<i>kang khuan e</i> same type REL	<i>kang khaun e</i> same type REL	<i>kang khaun e</i> same type REL
	<i>A-Ying kam A-Ha thak</i> A-Ying and A-Ha read <i>kang khuan e chhe</i> same type REL book	<i>mui chit-e gin-a thak</i> every one-CL child read <i>kang khuan e chhe</i> same type REL book	<i>A-Ying kuat-ting beh</i> A-Ying decide want <i>thak Odyssey. gua</i> read Odyssey I <i>suan kang khaun</i> choose same type <i>e chhe</i> REL book	<i>gua kam A-Ying thak</i> I and Paul read <i>kang khuan e chhe</i> same type REL book
Malai	<i>yang sama</i> the same	<i>yang sama</i> the same	<i>yang sama</i> the same	<i>yang sama dengan</i> the same as
	<i>Anne dan Mike telah</i> Anne and Mike PST- <i>membaca buku</i> read book <i>yang sama</i> the same	<i>Setiap budak</i> each child <i>membaca buku</i> read book <i>yang sama</i> the same	<i>Paul berputus</i> Paul decided <i>membaca Odyssey.</i> read Odyssey <i>Saya memilih</i> I choose <i>buku yang sama.</i> book the same	<i>Saya membaca buku</i> I read book <i>yang sama dengan</i> the same with <i>Paul.</i> Paul
Japanese	<i>onaji</i> the same	<i>onaji</i> the same	<i>onaji</i> the same	<i>to onaji</i> the same as/with
	<i>Annu to Maiku wa</i> Anne and Mike TOP <i>onaji hon o yon-da.</i> same book ACC read-PST	<i>Kodomo wa sorezore</i> child TOP each <i>onaji hon o yom-u.</i> same book ACC read-PST	<i>Pooru wa odyusseia o</i> Paul TOP Odyssey ACC <i>yom-u to kime-ta.</i> read-PR that decide-PST <i>Watashi wa/mo onaji</i> I TOP/also same <i>hon o eran-da.</i> book ACC choose-PST	<i>Watashi wa Pooru to</i> I TOP Paul that <i>onaji hon o yon-da.</i> same book ACC read-PST <i>Watashi wa Pooru ga</i> I TOP Paul NOM <i>yon-da no to onaji</i> read-PST that same <i>hon o yon-da.</i> book ACC read-PST
Swahili	<i>Sawa</i> <i>Vya aina moja</i>	<i>Cha aina moja</i> <i>sawa</i>	<i>Hichohicho</i> <i>pia</i>	<i>Sawa na</i> <i>Aina moja kama</i>
	<i>Ame na Mika</i> <i>wanasoma vitabu</i>	<i>Kila mtoto anasoma</i> <i>kitabu cha aina moja.</i>	<i>Paulo aliamua</i> <i>kusoma Odyssey. Na</i>	<i>Na soma kitabu sawa</i> <i>na Paulo.</i>

	<i>sawa.</i> <i>Ame na Mika</i> <i>wanasoma vitabu vya</i> <i>aina moja.</i>	<i>Kila mtoto anasoma</i> <i>vitabu sawa.</i>	<i>mimi mlichagua</i> <i>hichohicho.</i> <i>Paulo aliamua</i> <i>kusoma Odyssey. Na</i> <i>mimi pia.</i>	<i>Na soma kitabu aina</i> <i>moja kama Paulo.</i>
Chickasaw	<i>yamma-hchínaakayni</i> that-same (type) <i>yamm-akayni</i> that-same (token)	<i>yamma-hchínaakayni</i> that-same (type) <i>chaff-a'sj</i> be.one-only.DS		<i>yamma-hchínaakayni</i> that-same
	<i>Lynn Charles</i> Lynn Charles <i>táwwa'a-t holisso</i> be.together-SS book <i>yamma-hchínaakayni</i> that-same (type) <i>ittimanompoli-tok.</i> read-PST <i>Lynn Charles</i> Lynn Charles <i>táwwa'a-t holisso</i> be.together-SS book <i>yamm-akayni</i> that-same (token) <i>ittimanompoli-tok.</i> read-PST	<i>Móma-kat holisso</i> be.all-CMP.SS book <i>chaff-a'sj hoo-</i> be.one-only.DS PL- <i>ittimanompoli-tok.</i> read-PST <i>Móma-kat holisso</i> be.all-CMP.SS book <i>yamma-hchínaakayni</i> that-same <i>hoo-ittimanompoli-</i> PL-read <i>tok.</i> -PST		<i>Holisso ish-</i> book 2SG- <i>timanompoli-ka</i> read-CMP.DS <i>yamma-hchínaakayni</i> that-same <i>ittimanompoli-li-tok.</i> read-1SG-PST
Zapotec	<i>teb-izy</i> one-only	<i>teb-izy</i> one-only <i>lag</i> same	<i>lag-zag-i</i> same-just-that	<i>lag</i> same
	<i>Teb-izy liebr b-ily</i> one-only book PRF-read <i>Jwany cuan Bed.</i> Juan and Pedro	<i>Lag liebr-i b-ily</i> same book-that PRF-read <i>raa-ta ra mniny.</i> all-EMP PL child <i>Teb-izy liebr b-ily</i> one-only book PRF-read <i>raa-ta ra mniny.</i> all-EMP PL child	<i>Jwany b-ily Don</i> Juan PRF-read Don <i>Quijot lag-zag-i</i> Quijote same-just-that <i>b-ily-a.</i> PRF-read-1SG	<i>Lag liebr ni b-ily</i> same book REL PRF-read <i>Jwany b-ily Bed.</i> Juan PRF-read Pedro <i>Lag sa liebr ni</i> same fellow book REL <i>b-ily</i> PRF-read <i>Jwany b-ily Bed.</i> Juan PRF-read Pedro

Table A.1. Crosslinguistic data about same

A.2. Crosslinguistic data about *different/other*

Contrary to *same*, *different* can present several counterparts in a given language depending on the cases that are mentioned in this paper. As explained in section 5.2, I hypothesize that this is due to the fact that the case of DP selection and that of CP selection can correspond to different lexicalizations. Moreover, we do not observe this with *same* because terms like *identical* are not included in the survey: speakers do not seem to spontaneously translate *same* as *identical* (maybe because the difference between type and token readings is perceived as more important in the case of identity

than in the case of difference, since only in the former case does it impact the number of objects in question).

	Plural sentence-internal case	Quantified sentence-internal case	Sentence-external case	Case with overt linker
English	<i>a different/different</i>	<i>a different</i>	<i>a different/another</i>	<i>a different than/from/another than</i>
	<i>Anne and Mike read different books/a different book.</i>	<i>Every child read a different book.</i>	<i>Paul decided to read the Odyssey. I chose a different/another book.</i>	<i>I read a different book than/from Paul/another book than Paul.</i>
French	<i>un différent/des différents</i>	<i>un différent</i>	<i>un différent/un autre</i>	<i>un autre que/un différent de</i>
	<i>Anne et Michel ont lu un livre différent/des livres différents.</i>	<i>Chaque enfant a lu un livre différent.</i>	<i>Paul a décidé de lire l'Odyssée. J'ai choisi un livre différent/un autre livre.</i>	<i>J'ai lu un autre livre que Paul/un livre différent de Paul.</i>
Italian	<i>dei diversi different</i>	<i>un diverso a different</i>	a) <i>un diverso a different</i> b) <i>un altro another</i>	<i>un altro...rispetto a another...with respect to</i>
	<i>Anne e Michel hanno letto dei libri diversi</i>	<i>Ogni bambino ha letto un libro diverso</i>	<i>Paul ha deciso di leggere l'Odissea. Io ho scelto un libro diverso/un altro libro.</i>	<i>Io ho letto un altro libro rispetto a Paul</i>
Spanish	<i>diferente distinto</i>	<i>diferente distinto</i>	<i>diferente distinto</i>	<i>diferente distinto</i>
	<i>Ana y Miguel leyeron libros diferentes.</i>	<i>Todos los niños leyeron libros diferentes. / Cada niño leyó un libro diferente.</i>	<i>Pablo decidió leer la Odisea. Yo elegí un libro diferente / Yo elegí otro libro.</i>	<i>Yo leí un libro diferente que Pablo. / Yo leí un libro diferente al de Pablo.</i>
Portuguese	<i>diferentes different</i>	<i>um diferente a different</i>	<i>um diferente/outro a different/another</i>	<i>um diferente do a different from</i>
	<i>A Anne e o Mike leram livros diferentes.</i>	<i>Todas as crianças leram um livro diferente.</i>	<i>O Paul decidiu ler a Odisseia. Eu escolhi um livro diferente. Eu escolhi outro livro.</i>	<i>?Eu li um livro diferente do Paul. Eu li um livro diferente do do Paul.</i>
Dutch	<i>verschillende different</i>	<i>een ander a different</i>	<i>een ander a different</i>	<i>een ander... dan a different...than</i>
	<i>Anne en Mike lezen verschillende boeken</i>	<i>Ieder kind leest een ander boek</i>	<i>Paul besloot de Odysseus te lezen. Ik koos een ander boek</i>	<i>Ik lees een ander boek dan Paul.</i>
German	<i>verschieden</i>	<i>ein anderes/eine andere/einen andere</i>	<i>ein anderes/eine andere/einen andere</i>	<i>ein anderes/eine andere/einen andere als</i>
	<i>Anne und Mike haben verschiedene Bücher gelesen.</i>	<i>Jedes Kind hat ein anderes Buch gelesen.</i>	<i>Paul hat sich entschlossen, die Odyssee zu lesen. Ich habe mich für ein anderes Buch entschieden.</i>	<i>Ich habe ein anderes Buch gelesen als Paul.</i>
Russian	<i>raznye</i>	<i>raznye</i>	<i>druguju</i>	<i>?inuju ... chem</i>

	different	different	other	different than <i>ne tu ... kotoruju</i> not that... which
	<i>Anja i Misha</i> Any and Misha <i>pro-ch-l-i</i> <i>raznye</i> PRF-read-PST-PL different <i>knigi</i> books.	<i>*Kazhdyj rebjonok</i> Every child <i>pro-chjo-l raznuju</i> PRF-read-PST:SG different <i>knigu.</i> book. <i>Vse deti</i> all children <i>pro-ch-l-i raznye</i> PRF-read-PST-PL different <i>knigi.</i> books.	<i>Pasha reshil pro-ches-t'</i> Paul decided PRF-read-INF <i>Odisseju. Ja vybra-l</i> Odyssey. I choose-PST <i>druguju knigu</i> other book	<i>?Ja pro-chjo-l</i> I PRF-read-PST:SG <i>inuju knigu, chem</i> different book than Paul. <i>Pasha.</i> <i>Ja pro-chjo-l ne</i> I PRF-read-PST:SG not <i>tu knigu, kotoruju</i> that book which <i>chital Pasha.</i> read Paul.
Armenian	<i>en tarber</i> different	<i>e tarber</i> a different	a) <i>urish</i> b) <i>mek ayl</i> c) <i>tarber</i> d) <i>mek urish</i>	a) <i>?em ayl ... kan</i> b) <i>?em ...-ic tarber</i> c) <i>?em ...-i kardacacic</i> <i>tarber</i>
	<i>Annan u Majk@</i> <i>kardum en tarber</i> <i>grqer:</i>	<i>Yurakanchyur erexa</i> <i>kardum e tarber girk:</i>	<i>Pol@ voroshec kardal</i> <i>Vodisakan@: Yes @ntreci</i> <i>urish/mek ayl/ tarber/mek</i> <i>urish girk:</i>	<i>?Yes kardum em ayl</i> <i>girk, kan Pol@:</i> <i>?Yes kardum em Polic</i> <i>tarber girk:</i> <i>?Yes kardum em Poli</i> <i>kardacacic tarber girk:</i>
Bengali	a) <i>b^hin:o</i> different b) <i>εk-ek-ta</i> one-one-TA one.each	<i>εk-ek-ta</i> one-one-TA one.each	<i>on:o εk-ta</i> other one-TA another	<i>εk-ta ... aj ... on:o εk-</i> <i>ta</i> one-TA... and ... other one-TA
	<i>/εn aj majk b^hin:o</i> Anne and Mike different <i>boj por-e-tε^h-e/</i> book read-PRF-be-3 <i>/εn aj majk εk-ek-</i> Anne and Mike one-one- <i>dzon εk-ek-ta boj</i> CL one-one-CL book <i>por-e-tε^h-e/</i> read-PRF-be-3	<i>/εk-ek-ta batε:a εk-ek-</i> one-one-CL child one-one- <i>ta boj por-e-tε^h-e/</i> CL book read-PRF-be-3	<i>/pol εdisi por-a-ɹ</i> Paul Odyssey read-INF-GEN <i>mon t^hik koɹ-l-o. Ami</i> mind fix do-PST-3. I <i>on:o εk-ta boj</i> other one-CL book <i>betε^h-e ni-l-am/</i> choose-PRF take-PST-1	<i>/pol εk-ta boj</i> Paul one-CL book <i>por-e-tε^h-e aj ami</i> read-PRF-be-3 and I <i>on:o εk-ta boj</i> other one-CL book <i>por-e-tε^h-i/</i> read-PRF-be-1
Hebrew	<i>šonim</i> different-pl	<i>?aħer</i> other	<i>?aħer</i> other	<i>šone?/aħer</i> different/other
	<i>an u-maik qor?im</i> Anne and-Mike read.PL <i>sfarim šonim.</i> books different.PL	<i>kol yeled qore</i> all children read <i>sefer ?aħer.</i> book other	<i>pol hiħliṭ liqro?</i> Paul decide.PST read-INF <i>?et ha-odise?a. Ani</i> ACC DEF-Odyssey I <i>baħar-ti be-sefer</i> choose.PST-1SG in-book <i>?aħer.</i> other	<i>?ani qore sefer šone</i> I read book different <i>//?aħer mi-ze</i> other from-DEM.SG.M <i>še-qore pol.</i> that-read Paul

Turkish	<i>farklı ...-lar</i> different -PL	<i>farklı bir</i> different a	<i>farklı bir</i> different a	<i>'dan farklı bir</i> -from different a
	<i>Anne ve Mike farklı</i> Anne and Mike different <i>kitap-lar okudu-lar.</i> book-PL read-3.PL	<i>Her çocuk farklı</i> every child different <i>bir kitap oku-du.</i> a book read-PST	<i>Paul Odyssey'i</i> Paul Odyssey-SP <i>oku-ma-y-a karar</i> read-INF-buffer-DAT- <i>ver-di. Ben farklı</i> decide-PST. I different <i>bir kitap seç-ti-m</i> a book choose-PST-1SG	<i>Paul'dan farklı</i> Paul-from different <i>bir kitap oku-du-m</i> a book read-PST.1SG
Thai	<i>tāng</i>	<i>tāng</i>	<i>tāng</i>	<i>tāng</i>
	<i>Anne gub Mike arn'</i> <i>nung seu taang lem</i> <i>gun</i>	<i>Dek took kon arn' nung</i> <i>seu taang lem gun</i>	<i>Paul tud sin jai tee ja arn'</i> <i>Odysey. chun luek tee ja</i> <i>arn nung seu taang lem</i> <i>gun</i>	<i>chun arn nung seu</i> <i>taang lem gun gub</i> <i>Paul</i>
Taiwanese	<i>bo kang khuan e</i> NEG same type REL	<i>chit-pun bo kang</i> one-CL NEG same <i>khuan e</i> type REL	<i>chit-pun bo kang</i> one-CL NEG same <i>khuan e</i> type REL	
	<i>A-Ha kam A-Ying</i> A-Ha and A-Ying <i>thak bo kang khuan</i> read NEG same type <i>e chhe</i> REL book	<i>mui chit-e gin-a thak</i> every one-CL child read <i>chit-pun bo kang</i> one-CL NEG same <i>kuan e chhe</i> type REL book	<i>A-Ying kuat-ting beh</i> A-Ying decide want <i>thak Odyssey. gua suan</i> read Odyssey. I choose <i>chit-pun bo kang</i> one-CL NEG same <i>khuan e chhe</i> type REL book	<i>gua thak chit-pun kam</i> I read one-CL and <i>A-Ying bo kang-</i> A-Ying NEG same <i>khuan e chhe</i> type REL book
Malai	<i>yang berlainan</i> other	<i>yang berbeza daripada</i> <i>yang lain</i> different from other	<i>yang lain</i> another	<i>yang lain daripada</i> another than
	<i>Anne dan Mike telah</i> Anne and Mike past- <i>membaca buku</i> read book <i>yang berlainan</i> different	<i>Setiap budak membaca</i> each child read <i>buku yang berbeza</i> book different <i>daripada yang lain</i> from other	<i>Paul berputus membaca</i> Paul decided read <i>Odyssey. Saya memilih</i> Odyssey I choose <i>yang lain</i> other	<i>Saya membaca buku</i> I read book <i>yang lain daripada</i> other from <i>Paul</i> Paul
Japanese	<i>chigat-ta</i> differing (verb) <i>kotonat-ta</i> differing (verbe) <i>betsu no</i> of difference	<i>chigat-ta</i> differing (verb) <i>kotonat-ta</i> differing (verb) <i>betsu no</i> of difference	<i>chigat-ta</i> differing (verb) <i>kotonat-ta</i> differing (verb) <i>betsu no</i> of difference	<i>chigat-ta</i> differing (verb) <i>kotonat-ta</i> differing (verb) <i>betsu no</i> of difference

	<p><i>Annu to Maiku wa</i> Anne and Mike TOP <i>chigat-ta hon o</i> differ-PST book ACC <i>yon-da.</i> read-PST</p> <p><i>Annu to Maiku wa</i> Anne and Mike TOP <i>kotonat-ta hon o</i> differ-PST book ACC <i>yon-da</i> read-PST</p> <p><i>Annu to Maiku wa</i> Anne and Mike TOP <i>betsu no hon o</i> difference GEN book ACC <i>yon-da.</i> read-PST</p>	<p><i>Kodomo wa soezore</i> child TOP each <i>chigat-ta/kotona-ta/</i> differ-PST <i>betsu no hon o</i> difference GEN book ACC <i>yom-u</i> read-PST</p>	<p><i>Pooru wa Odyusseia</i> Paul TOP Odyssey <i>o yom-u to kime-ta.</i> ACC read-PST that decide-PST <i>Watashi wa chigat-ta/</i> I TOP differ-PST / <i>kotona-ta/betsu no</i> differ-PST difference GEN <i>hon o eran-da.</i> book ACC choose-PST</p>	<p><i>Watashi wa Pooru</i> I TOP Paul <i>to wa chigat-ta/</i> than TOP differ-PST <i>kotona-ta/betsu</i> differ-PST difference <i>no hon o yon-da.</i> GEN book ACC read-PST</p>
Swahili	<i>tofauti</i>	<i>tofauti</i>	<i>tofauti na yeye kingine</i>	<i>tofauti na</i>
	<i>Ame na Mika wanasoma vitabu tofauti.</i>	<i>Kila mtoto anasoma kitabu tofauti.</i>	<i>Paulo aliamua kusoma Odyssey. Nikachagua kitabu tofauti na yeye. Paulo aliamua kusoma Odyssey. Nikachagua kingine.</i>	<i>Na soma kitabu tofauti na Paulo.</i>
Chickasaw	<i>iitimila</i> be.different	<i>ittimilayyokha-ho</i> be.different-FOC.ACC		<i>ila-</i> be.different-NOM
	<i>Charles ii-tawwa'a-t</i> C. 1PL-be.together-SS <i>holisso iitimila</i> book be.different <i>ii-timanompoli-tok.</i> 1PL-read-PST	<i>Moma-kat holisso</i> be.all-CMP.SS book <i>ittimilayyokha-ho</i> be.different-FOC.ACC <i>ittimanopoli-tok.</i> read-PT		<i>Charles-at holisso</i> Charles-NOM book <i>chaffa-ho</i> be.one-FOC.ACC <i>ittimanompoli-</i> read- <i>kma ila-</i> TEMP.DS be.different-NOM <i>ittimanompoli-li-tok</i> read-1SG-PST
Zapotec	<i>reiny</i> different	<i>reiny</i> different	<i>reiny</i> different	
	<i>Reiny liebr b-ily</i> different book PRF-read <i>Jwany, rein liebr</i> Juan different book <i>b-ily Bed.</i> PRF-read Pedro	<i>Reiny liebr b-ily</i> different book PRF-read <i>cad teiby mniny.</i> each one book	<i>Jwany b-ily Don Quijot,</i> Juan PRF-read Don Quijote <i>na reiny liebr</i> 1SG different book <i>b-ily-a.</i> PRF-read-1SG	

Table A.2. Crosslinguistic data about different/other

B. The issue of determiners

B.1. *Même*

As compared to *différent* and *autre*, *même* exhibits a specific behavior with respect to its determiner and to definiteness. I consider this issue as independent from my main issue, but here are some facts illustrating this specificity of *même*.²⁴

- *même* cannot be used predicatively without the determiner *le*.

- (110) a. Ce livre est *(le) même que celui-là.
'This book is (the) same as this one.'
b. *Je ne le trouve pas même aujourd'hui.
'I don't find him same today.'
c. *Luc et Flore n'ont rien acheté de même.
'Luc and Flore did not buy anything same.'

- the only determiners compatible with sentence-internal *même* are the definite determiner *le/les* (singular and plural), and the indefinite one *un* (only singular) in certain contexts (see Author: 2011 for more details about this).

- (111) a. Luc et Flore ont lu *quelques/*divers/*certains/*plusieurs/*trois/*des/les mêmes livres.
'Luc and Flore read some/various/certain/several/three/ø/the same books.'
b. Luc et Flore ont lu ?un/*leur/#ce/le même livre.
'Luc and Flore read a/their/this/the same book.'

- *même* cannot be modified by adverbs.

- (112) Luc et Flore ont lu le (*vraiment/*très/*presque/*tout/*toujours) même livre.
'Luc and Flore read the (really/very/almost/very/always) same book.'

- *même* cannot be coordinated with other adjectives.²⁵

- (113) Luc et Flore ont acheté le (*petit et/*premier et/*seul et) même livre.
'Luc and Flore bought the (small and/first and/only and) same book.'

Furthermore, even if the definite determiner is used with *même*, it does not exhibit the usual properties of the definite article. In particular, it does not appear to trigger a presupposition of unique existence: whether or not there is a unique book that Luc and Flore read is precisely what is at issue in the following sentence.

²⁴ Cf. e.g. Van Peteghem 1997 for a discussion on that matter.

²⁵ There is an exception with *unique* ('unique') and *seul* ('sole') that can coordinate with *même* (*la même et unique personne* 'the very same person'; *une seule et même personne* 'a same and unique person').

- (114) Est-ce que Luc et Flore ont lu le même livre?
'Did Luc and Flore read the same book?'

This issue of definiteness with *same* and *même* is examined in more detail in e.g. Barker 2007, Solomon 2009, Author 2010, 2011.

B.2. *Différent*

French *différent* does not always occur in a postnominal adjectival position, but it may also occur in prenominal position, which seems to correspond to the position of the determiner since there is no bare plural in French.

- (115) a. J'ai vu différents films pendant les vacances.
b. J'ai vu des films différents pendant les vacances.
'I watched different movies during the holidays.'

At first glance, (115)a (with prenominal *différent*) and (115)b (with postnominal *différent*) are roughly synonymous: they both exhibit a vague reading, i.e. not strongly reciprocal; each movie that I watched does not have to be different from the others. But in fact, it seems that there is a contrast between (115)a and (115)b. In (a), the difference primarily comes from plurality, i.e. there are different tokens of movies; this can correlate with other kinds of difference, but the accent is put on the difference in token, while it is put on the difference in type in (115)b. Thus in (115)a, *différent* seems to amount to a determiner like *quelques* ('some') while it rather resembles the adjective *varié* ('various') in (115)b. This issue would be worth further investigating, but it has not been examined in this paper as it is idiosyncratic to French and is orthogonal to the main problem (see a.o. Van Peteghem: 1997, Tovenà and Van Peteghem: 2006 for a discussion on that issue).